



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_26615
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission of HIV; Socio-economic determinants of knowledge, attitude and practice among pregnant women in Abia State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract needs to be revised see comments appended. Results section needs revision i.e. specify clearly what are the findings on: • Knowledge about PMTCT • Attitude about PMTCT • Practice about PMTCT The research study has no gap because there is no synthesis of previous research studies to isolate the gap. i.e. On introduction there is a lot of information about HIV and AIDS and not on Socio-economic determinants of knowledge, attitude and practice among pregnant women in Abia State, Nigeria. Going through the article, I feel no new information on PMTCT has come out. The researcher is supposed to come up with nuances that will stimulate the readers and also accept it	Sorry the comment/suggestions were not attached in the previous document sent to us. This made it too broad for our responses. -effected; title objective, methods, conclusion –modified as suggested -see tables/results as they were taken care of by different tables -am not very clear on gap referred to as at introduction section. lines 106-110 stated the high prevalence in the state....., 117 -119 stated low uptake and knowledge..... Essence of gap is to justify why the study is worth going on with based on gaps from literature search or what is on ground which this section tried to address unless you still believe that it is not adequate. Equally most previous studies were mainly descriptive involving either urban or rural but this study tried comparing the two which is a step ahead References



SDI Review Form 1.6

	for publication. It all goes back to analysis of the study gap. If the gap is not teased out clearly then it's difficult for the nuances to be discovered. References are a bit out of date over ten years. Find current references. Ethical Issues: Dealing with pregnant women who are HIV positive might pose some ethical issues but none has so far been described in the study i.e. physical and emotional stress during the interview period. Anxiety brought up by the interviewer's questions and fear of stigma and discrimination once fellow clients at the ANC, relatives and friends deduce from their participation in the study their HIV status.	-modified THOUGH we could not cite a good substitute for some that are over 10 years so we were not able to change them. -corrections effected -see ethical consideration section in methods -no emotional and mental stress as most have overcome stigma issues Others Setting -why choice was addressed at introduction. Reduction of it may bring up questions on sampling technique section Tables -I appreciate your suggestion though removing tables 2 -4 and leaving table 5 will make it so difficulty and clumsy for reader as what will be the variables that ve the summary
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		