



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_31094
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular Detection and Typing of Genital Human Papillomavirus Among Female Medical and Nursing Students in Harare, Zimbabwe
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Provide a justification for the study. 2. What is the reason of the study with medical and nursing students? What is the relation between these women and the presence or absence of the virus in their organism? 3. Check if the study may have some type of conflict of interest. 4. Cite in Methodology the number of individuals of the study and their inclusion and/or exclusion characteristics. 5. What is the content of the presentation given to the participants: a. Information about the virus; B. Information about the infection; w. Information on prophylaxis; D. Information on how the study would be; etc. Make this clear in the text. 6. Could self-collection interfere with study results? Would not it have been better only an experienced professional for this type of activity? Another problem is the collection has been made in the patients' home. How to ensure that the sample collected is really from the patient? 7. Describe the used primers. 8. Recalculate the percentages from Table 1. For example, the percentage of 78 students out of a total of 125 is 62.4%. As described in the article. However, the percentage of 35 female students who had zero or one sexual partner would be 28% and not 61.5%, as described in Table 1.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jonatas R. de Oliveira
Department, University & Country	UNESP, Brazil