



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_45838
Title of the Manuscript:	KNOWLEDGE, PREVENTIVE PRACTICES AND RISK PERCEPTION OF HIV INFECTION AMONG PREGNANT WOMEN IN A RURAL COMMUNITY OF IGBAGU, IZZI LGA, EBONYI STATE 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>)



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>a) Some few grammatical terms were used that need clarification (correction already made).</p> <p>b) Discussion was too long from line 185 -245 Please important finding should be discuss not the entire research work pertinent finding, interesting finding not talking about all the finding.</p> <p>c) Some of the figure does not add up to 443 the sample size please correct and recalculate.</p> <p>d) The repetition was too common because both the table and the discussion of the table are virtually the same why the repetition.</p> <p>e)</p>	<p>1. Thanks for the numerous intext corrections in grammar and setting of the manuscript. They were all noted and effect. We appreciate so much.</p> <p>2. The figure that did not add up on table 4 has been rechecked and corrected</p> <p>3. The discussion was casted in order to show that all the objectives of the study were achieved. The authors considered that since knowledge is a composite index, it was pertinent to explore the variables that constituted the knowledge items. Bringing them out clearly and discussing the finding could enable policy maker evolve thematic areas for health education of the rural women as the finding showed the gaps in HIV and PMTCT knowledge among them. Discussion of risk perception would also enable policy makers understand the driving force of HIV infection among the women as should by the logistic regression model. This could also be the bases for planning and further research into HIV in such settings.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Some area need clarification as already highlighted via the tract changes please take note Please let us reclassify, do it in the scientific method:</p> <p>a) Brief introduction...</p> <p>b) Objective...</p> <p>c) Method and Setting</p> <p>d) Results</p> <p>e) Conclusion</p> <p>The study area was too long, stop wasting your time on this what is it done at your setting that is pertinent to your study Tertiary institution / or teaching hospital is enough ...no body care about your registrars. Please be brief and specific</p>	<p>A. Thanks for the tract changes their comments were noted and appropriate corrections effected as follows</p> <p>1. The questionnaire was adapted and modified from UNFPA country programme of assistance to Nigeria, baseline/end line survey: Individual questionnaires for females 12 to 64 years of age and another questionnaire for Tanzanian Integrated PMTCT survey; a Linkage project publication. These have been referenced in text.</p> <p>2. How the sample size was arrived at has been shown in the manuscript. The predetermined HIV (vertical transmission) knowledge prevalence of approximately 60% as cited in the manuscript gave an estimated sample size of 369. 20 % came out as 74 both of which summed up to 443</p> <p>3. The nurses who assisted in data collection were pretrained on data collection for the study. This has been stated in the manuscript</p> <p>4. The ratio of 36%:64% for proportionate recruitment and interviewing of the pregnant women was arrived at based on the historic ANC booking obtained from the facilities records of over the preceding 11 months period prior to the study. This has been clearly explained in the manuscript.</p> <p>5. The method used in categorizing knowledge is one of the accepted a validated ways of categorizing knowledge by the West African College of Physicians and National Post graduate Medical College of Nigeria (Post graduate colleges which I and some of authors are fellows of). It involves using the mid point of the total composite scores of converting the composite scores to percentage and using the 50% mark as the dividing line. This is most appropriate when the study protocol also involves the use of binary logistic regression in which the dependent variable must be dichotomized. Many studies also reported knowledge using same methods</p> <p>6. Awareness was assessed as well as knowledge. To determine awareness, respondents were asked whether they have heard about HIV. Though not stated in the methodology, some of them whose response was NO were further prompted by giving a description of</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<p>the condition using local dialect. At this point all of them had heard about the condition</p> <p>7. Some of the descriptions of the tables have been summarized. However, the authors described the table because, conventionally and according to the authors' guide for publication in this journal, it is required that each table (figures) should be described and such description should come before the table and the referred table should be put in bracket. The guideline also went further to state that the result section should not be repeated in the discussion section.</p> <p>8. "Over 60%" as stated in the manuscript was used to show the proportion that knew the various respective means of HIV transmission. These means are shown on table 1 and include transmission by sexual intercourse, vertical transmission, by infected blood and blood product and use of sharp. Further down the sentence, a statement on unsafe blood transfusion was made in order to separate it from other means which was known to more than 60% of the pregnant women</p> <p>B. The authors followed the authors' guideline for publication. However, the manuscript has been edited to follow scientific method as commented</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author did a good research work and the basic setting was satisfactory, detail and clear.	Please I will sincerely welcome any other comments and corrections that would make the publication worth the while.

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	