



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International STD Research &amp; Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_I-SRR_25517</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Vulnerability and Gonorrhea: A Qualitative Study of Black Women in South Africa</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Provide institutional review board (IRB) or independent ethics committee determination/information in the methodology. If IRB approval was not obtained, explain how the ethics of informed consent, participant confidentiality and ability to participate/decline voluntarily was properly administered. For instance, is "lifeLife" legally allowed to recruit participants for research?</b></p> <p><b>Were only black individuals recruited for this study? In that case, what type of protection was provided to the participants so that they can enrol in the study without being coerced?</b></p> <p><b>There are no serious ethical issues. Since the subject material is sensitive and the female participants of this study could be more vulnerable by enrolling as human subjects. I am curious to know what steps did the research team employed to address confidentiality, informed consent for participation and ability to free volunteer and withdraw. For instance, did the authors obtain approval and oversight from an agency or committee that oversees human subject protection?</b></p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Fix typographical erros and grammar mistakes. For instance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Line 42 – "objective ^ in"</li> <li>2. Line 43 space between ? and "</li> </ol>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>This is an important research finding. I am very eager to know if the researcher looked for any such data available on African American women and their issues in similar context. The authors mention a comparison study. But, any analysis of published knowledge on women of African origin in other industrialized countries would greatly enhance the discussion of this article. For instance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bazargan (2000) J. natl Med Assoc (<a href="http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2608615/">http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2608615/</a>)</li> </ol>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>2. Maureen et al (2008) Sexually Transmitted Diseases – Vol 35 pp696-702 (<a href="http://journals.lww.com/stdjournal/Abstract/2008/07000/HIV_the_Clustering_of_Sexually_Transmitted.11.aspx">http://journals.lww.com/stdjournal/Abstract/2008/07000/HIV_the_Clustering_of_Sexually_Transmitted.11.aspx</a>)</p> <p>3. Weinstock et al (2007) DOI: 10.1363/3600604</p> <p>I agree with the authors that quantitative follow up studies must be conducted to arrive at a broader understanding.</p>	
--	---	--

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Moses Prabu</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Middle Tennessee University, USA</i></b>