



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_38084
Title of the Manuscript:	Sexual Health Communication Strategies and HIV/AIDS Awareness among Students in Teachers' Colleges in Central Uganda
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<u>REVIEW COMMENTS</u> Line 47 Separate the word inform Line 66 spelling of the word communication Line 75 (vi) Action oriented meetings for children on safety friends - this does not make sense Line 77 school talk shows on sex abuse – rather use sexual abuse Line 92 More explanation is needed on why you picked one science tutor and one tutor in charge of counseling Line 100 How was qualitative data collected, who conducted the interviews, how many were they, how was recruitment for the qualitative data collection done – these details are needed Line 94 and interviews, which kind of interviews, one on one, with who, round table – with who, for how long and who administered the interviews. This needs to be clarified. 104 There respondents – make a correction, students are now mentioned! What were the ages 107 Are teacher trainees boys and girls or men and women? You have not mentioned the consenting process in your methodology, how did you get authorization to conduct the study 137 conducted and not conduct 140 Which children are you talking about here – do you mean pupils 148 which students, are you referring to teacher trainees 156 Now you introduce student teacher – be consistent Clearly include in the methodology your dependent and independent variables 177 students will give pupils – quite confusing 194 – 202 was this a finding? Otherwise it should be in the literature review. It is irrelevant in this section 204-2011 similar as above	These comments have been addressed and highlighted yellow in the respective positions in the text. Has been addressed see methodology section We have corrected boys and girls with males and females. The ‘respondents’ has been left because we have spelt out who these respondents are within this line. Not traced this statement!



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Consent issue: The author needs to clarify the consenting process	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		