



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International STD Research & Reviews</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_31495
Title of the Manuscript:	KNOWLEDGE OF HIV/AIDS TRANSMISSION AND RISK PERCEPTION AMONG ANTENATAL CARE ATTENDEES IN ABAKALIKI, SOUTHEAST NIGERIA
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The references were too weak to discuss results. Can be enriched. In some parts of the manuscript there are some missing references to be cited. (those were mentioned as a footnote on .pdf format). As mentioned on .pdf tables should be rearranged for good appearance.</p> <p>Some miss-written words and sentences exists take care for corrections. It is suitable to re-check the whole manuscript for English language.</p> <p>Some missing parts and corrections were mentioned on manuscript for corrections on .pdf file as footnote mark.</p> <p>Plagiarism Issue: Yes. Especially at Introduction section at line 55-67 no references were cited and I could not be able to check for plagiarism. The authors should be asked for it. Some sentences were copied and pasted from references those were cited. The manuscript should be written in their own sentences.</p> <p>references, spelling mistakes, table arrangements, and should be checked for plagiarism suspect</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Table 2, 5 and 6 can be combined.	
Optional/General comments	<p>Results and discussion are weak can be enriched</p> <p>References were replicated too many times so new references can be added.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bora Ekinici
Department, University & Country	Mugla Sitki Kocman University, Turkey