



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International STD Research &amp; Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_36756
Title of the Manuscript:	SEXUAL PRACTICES OF FEMALE SEX WORKERS IN IBADAN, 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 (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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lines 18 – 21: Indicate the proportion of respondents using cocaine or other drugs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The author(s) present the prevalence of HIV but failed to present any statistics on the other STIs. What therefore is the prevalence of the other STIs?</li> </ul> <p><b>Methodology:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Study area: Describe Oyo state in which participants were recruited.</li> <li>Study population: Describe the inclusion and exclusion criteria.</li> <li>Pretest of instrument: the questionnaire was pre-tested on how many FSWs? It is hard to understand what 10% represents. The correlation coefficient obtained from the pretest is very weak.</li> <li>Data management, analysis and presentation: line 140, it is mentioned that the data collected was scored. How was the scoring done? Why is scores not presented in the results? What was the chi-square test used for?</li> <li>Ethical consideration: Which institutional review board approved of the study?</li> </ul> <p><b>Results:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lines 156 – 157 is contradictory to figure 1 which shows that a minority were orphan.</li> <li>Figure 1, 2 and 3 should be deleted and the information presented in table 1.</li> <li>Figure 4 and 5 should also be deleted and the information collated under “Condom use at last sexual intercourse” and “Protection from contracting HIV” respectively in table 2.</li> <li>Line 186: Title is not clear. I suggest you use a better title for example “Respondents’ sexual risk practices” etc. correct title of table 3 as well.</li> <li>What can the author(s) say about the overall sexual practice of the target population? Author(s) should compare practice indicators between the different socio-demographic characteristics of the participants. For example is the sexual practice of the sex workers influenced by the level of education etc.?</li> <li>It is also interesting to know the prevalence of HIV and other STIs in the target population.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Discussion will need to be written with focus on discussing key findings. Throughout the manuscript the author(s) focus on discussing the role of condoms in preventing HIV. Does condoms protect only against HIV? Or is unsafe sexual practices associated with contracting only HIV?</p>	<p>Ok</p> <p>Ok</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Line 197: How does being single relate with an individual's sexual practice?</li> <li>Lines 210 – 211: Sentence is not clear. How do we know that the degree of sexual practice of the target population was generally poor when it is not shown in the results? How was it deduced?</li> <li>Lines 214 – 216: What about the risk of contracting STIs? This point should also be discussed.</li> <li>Incorrect use of terminology: not using condom is in itself an unsafe sexual practice. This has been mentioned in the background (see lines 37 – 39). How does it predisposes to unsafe sexual practice as mentioned in the discussion and the conclusion? Incorrect use of the word “predispose” and this should be corrected.</li> <li>Lines 203 – 209, compare findings to similar studies.</li> <li>The study by Lim et al (2015) revealed a correlation between use of condom and knowledge on sexual and reproductive health among participants. Participants practice may be influenced by their knowledge which has not been assessed in this study. This constitute a major weakness of the study and should therefore be discussed as a limitation. Discuss this and other study limitations and also identify areas needing more research.</li> <li>Has the sexual practice of FSWs in Ibadan changed over time? Compare findings with study by Umer et al. (2002).</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Lines 237 – 238 is not clear.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Line 15 &amp; 18: In the results, change “many” to “A majority”</li> <li>Keywords: Sexual practice and sexual behavior are very similar, use just one. I suggest you add Ibadan and Nigeria to keyword.</li> <li>Sample size estimation: Indicate a reference for the formula.</li> <li>Change “brothel based” to “brothel-based” throughout the manuscript.</li> </ul>	Ok
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The author(s) assessed the sexual practices of female sex workers in Ibadan, Nigeria. The scope of the study is very limited as female sex workers' knowledge on sexual and reproductive health was not assessed which constitutes the major weakness of the study. The major strength of the study is the target population. The manuscript will benefit from language editing before it is fit for publication. My comments that will help improve on the quality of the manuscript above.	Ok