



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_45305
Title of the Manuscript:	Pattern of Sexually Transmitted Infections: A Retrospective Profile from a Sexually Transmitted Infections Clinic of a Secondary Care Hospital in Lagos, 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=sd-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 29: increase the keywords to five Line 51: Recast the sentence to minimize repetition of words: study can be substituted for review, investigate, examine etc. Lines 58 and 59: Provide the ethical reference number Line 70: Relate the total number of patients examined vis-à-vis the sex. Then compare result to line 98 and table 1. Lines 95-102: inconsistency in the presentation of results. Discussion should flow with how the results were presented starting with sex, marital status, age, occupation, educational level and tribe	The keywords have been increased to five The word "study" has been changed to review The ethical approval number has been included The total number of patients examined has been related to sex and the correct percentages has been written. The inconsistency in the presentation of results and discussion on lines 95- 102 has been corrected and the format of the discussion now follow the reviewers suggestion. All the corrections are highlighted in the body of the manuscript. Thank you.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Sample size for the One year study was way too small.	The number of patients that attended the clinic for one year was just 31 and it has been included as the limitation of the study.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	