



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International STD Research &amp; Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_46022
Title of the Manuscript:	Pattern of condom usage among male and female youths in 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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The referencing requires a revision following comments on the documents e.g. single reference [6] while multiple to be [6, 7, 8] or more than 2 references [6-8].</li> <li>2. Ethical approval means the approval and not collected from as collection does not mean approved.</li> <li>3. HIV is a lab identified virus which is an infection and not infections</li> <li>4. In the introduction, combine all behaviour issues</li> <li>5. Write a narrative introduction of key results section with reference to tables that follow.</li> <li>6. No limitations indicated in the paper</li> </ol>	<p>We have amended the referencing requirement</p> <p>We have made the corrections as recommended</p> <p>The errors have been corrected</p> <p>We have combined all behaviour issues</p> <p>Limitations have been added.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the discussion, avoid repeating what is in the results and give a reference for any information of another study</li> <li>2. In the recommendation, there is no strategy related to strategies of policy makers of health who were quoted in the introduction as having been a challenge to giving youth information on condoms use.</li> <li>3. The author should review the use of quantitative analysis method application on qualitative data as these two are different.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted and corrected</p> <p>It has been added</p> <p>We have reviewed the part.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Integrate demographic factors for males and females in one table. This would make reading and comparisons easier</p> <p>The paper contributes important information and important knowledge</p> <p>Review the reference section to ensure conformity with the journal</p>	<p>We appreciate the suggestion. However, there is no way we can merge the demographic factors for males and females in one table considering the fact that we have three survey to capture in the table.</p> <p>We have reviewed it.</p>

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	NO