



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International STD Research &amp; Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_44410
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF PEER EDUCATION AND PROVISION OF ON-SITE HCT SERVICES ON THE UPTAKE OF HCT AMONG PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN EBONYI STATE, SOUTH EAST 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>)

**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>methodology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I think details of the sample size calculation are needed; set variables, mathematical demonstrations, etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>Results</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Result comments should always precede tables or figures and not the reverse.</li> </ul> <p><b>References</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An appropriate guide should be consulted to harmonize the list. Authors should start by slashing off the months in some references</li> </ul>	<p><b>This has been duly noted, although the mathematical procedure seemed too long to add to the manuscript, but we have summarised it as highlighted in the manuscript and added the details here for your review.</b></p> <p><b>Sample Size Determination</b></p> <p>To compare the proportion of students who will take-up HCT in the intervention and comparison group, the following formula for independent proportions was used to determine the minimum sample size required;</p> $n = \frac{[Z\alpha + Z\beta]^2 [P_1(1 - P_1) + P_2(1 - P_2)]}{[P_1 - P_2]^2}$ <p>Where:</p> <p>n = the sample size required in each group.</p> <p>P<sub>1</sub> = first proportion</p> <p>P<sub>2</sub> = second proportion</p> <p>P<sub>1</sub> - P<sub>2</sub> = size of difference of clinical importance</p> <p>" Zα " depends on 5% significance level</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<p>" Z<math>\beta</math> " depends on desired power i.e. 80%</p> <p>The values of P<sub>1</sub> and P<sub>2</sub> were obtained from previous studies.</p> <p>P<sub>1</sub>= 11% (0.11) which was the expected HCT uptake in the intervention group after intervention<sup>66</sup></p> <p>P<sub>2</sub>= 5.5 % (0.055) the expected HCT uptake in the control group without intervention activities<sup>81</sup></p> <p>P<sub>1</sub> - P<sub>2</sub> = Size of difference of clinical importance; here is 11% - 5.5% = 5.5%</p> <p>Z<math>\alpha</math> = 5% significance level = 1.96</p> <p>Z<math>\beta</math> = the desired power of 80%, (0.84 for two tail test)</p> $n = \frac{[1.96 + 0.84]^2 [0.11 (1- 0.11) + 0.055 ( 1- 0.055) ]}{[0.11 - 0.055]^2}$ $n = \frac{[ 7.84 ] [ 0.11(0.89) + [0.055 (0.945) ]}{0.003025}$ $n = \frac{[ 7.84 ] [ 0.0979 +0.051975]}{0.003025}$ $n = \frac{7.84 \times 0.149875}{0.003025}$ $n = \frac{1.17502}{0.003025} , n = 388.4 = 388$ <p>An attrition rate of 20% was anticipated, giving 77.68 to allow for loss to follow-up. A sample size of 466 was selected from the intervention group and the comparison group respectively. This was sufficient to detect a difference of 5.5% between the groups with 80% power and at 5% significance level.</p> <p>Total Study participants = 932.</p> <p>Results: All the comments have been changed to precede the tables.</p> <p>References: This has been corrected accordingly and highlighted</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Authors demonstrate a good mastery of language; but, better still to carry out a final thorough check, with much focus on a few typographic errors.	Thank you. I have tried to go through the manuscript and found some typographical errors which have been corrected and highlighted.



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Work is so appealing, and should be considered upon revision.	Thank you. We have made corrections accordingly kindly accept the corrections
----------------------------------	---	---

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>I think details of the sample size calculation are yet to be provided</p>	This has been done as shown in comment (1) above