



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms JESBS 36128
Title of the Manuscript:	SOCIAL DISTANCE TOWARDS HIV VERSUS MENTAL ILLNESS IN A SAMPLE OF ADOLESCENT STUDENTS IN LAGOS NIGERIA
New Title of the Manuscript:	SOCIAL DISTANCE TOWARDS PEOPLE WITH HIV-AIDS VERSUS MENTAL ILLNESS IN A SAMPLE OF ADOLESCENT SECONDARY STUDENTS IN LAGOS NIGERIA
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Methodology: All the suggested corrections under Methodology have been addressed. However, the author need to improve the sentence structure and paragraph format as the section does not read nicely. Results: Please report the percentage of each social distance variable together with the 95% CI of the percentage. For example, 20.6% of participants reported feeling afraid to converse with HIV affected person, compared to 71.8% feeling afraid to converse with persons with Mental illness. It is important to report the 95% CI of both the reported percentages – what is the 95% CI for the 20.6%, and what is the 95% CI for the 71.8%. For this same example, the 95% CI given is -41.10 to 60.01. I am not sure what this value means because the range of the 95% CI reported is not including both percentages mentioned earlier. Please look into this before the article can be accepted for publication. Discussion: Please add reference to the statements made in the new paragraph added in page 9, line 192-198	Thank you very much for your valuable comments and prompt evaluation. The paragraph format and sentence structure has been revised as recommended. The inclusion of the confidence intervals is based on the initial Reviewer's comment that a test of proportion should be done to compare difference in proportion of stigmatising behaviour for each item of the social distance scale. With due respect Sir/Ma, Please let me clarify that the confidence interval calculated by the author was the confidence interval for proportion, and not confidence interval for mean. The range of Confidence interval for mean will definitely include the mean value for each variable item, but confidence interval for proportion (difference in proportion between % of stigmatising behaviour for each item of the social distance scale for HIV vs. Mental illness) may not necessarily follow this pattern. Furthermore, the response pattern for the social distance scale used in this study is yes/no and not a scale (e.g. 0-5), therefore, only proportion (%) can be computed, and not mean from the responses of the participants. However, the negative value (-41) was actually an error which has now been corrected. For the avoidance of doubt, the results of the statistical analysis of the test of proportion done by the author can easily be verified online using any online based data analysis software e.g. MEDCALC. The relevant statements in the new paragraph has been referenced as recommended Thank you once again for your valuable comments. They have been instrumental in improving the quality of this manuscript.