SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International STD Research & Reviews**
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)
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	**1. Title: since this is a time-period study, add '1999-2008'.** **2. Clearly but briefly state study/manuscript objective(s).** **3. Correct unclear words/phrases/sentences/paragraphs as indicated in the reviewed document attached.** **4. Any information from other sources should be acknowledged.** **5. Justify choice of the 1999-2008 period for a study conducted in 2018. Be consistent to this timing (See K27).** **6. Use statistics term/jargons correctly and appropriately.** **7. Use HIV and AIDS NOT HIV/AIDS. They are not the same.** **8. Specify risk behaviors for the youth in general, Nigeria and those focused on in this study.** 9. **Clearly present competing opinions on condom education for the youth in Nigeria.** 10. **Introduction:** In this section present clearly what is known about condom use among youth in Nigeria and globally and some factors established. Then state the contribution of this study to this understanding. That is the knowledge gap this study attempted to fill (see K25). **11. How do you define and use the term 'ethnic group'. It has different meanings in different contexts.** **12. Methodology section should be reworked to reflect journal's requirements: study area and why? Methods for data collection, data management and analyses and ethical considerations. See review comments.** **13. Results: There are fluctuations on trends presented in all tables that are taken for granted but have implications to the study. For example, see all variables in Tables 1 & 2.** **14. Use standard categories of each variable. New/operational ones need explanation. For example, 'formerly married' in Tables 1 & 2.** **15. All striking results need to be presented in the discussion section. For example, the interpretation of the statistically significant results should be presented in the discussion.** **16.** Make a trend (1999 to 2008) presentation versus ranges (See K & K39). There are declines in 2008 compared to 2003 and 1999 or vice versa. Reasons for these observations need to be established/presented in the discussion section!**In my view, this is the strength of this study. Present clearly the comparisons over time (1999 – 2008) and between male and female youth against different variables and other studies reviewed.** **17. Discussion: present/discuss key findings and develop grounds for conclusions and recommendations as informed by findings. Link findings from other studies to this study. That is, explain why there are convergences or divergences in findings, conclusion and may be recommendations.** **18. Conclusion and recommendation sections should be results-borne, not from guess work.**	
Minor REVISION comments	1. The manuscript critically needs editing.	
Optional/General comments	1. Rethinking about the objective(s) [which are not stated though in the manuscript!!!] of the study and addressing comments made could improve this manuscript for publication.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Switbert Rwechungura Kamazima***
Department, University & Country	***Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, Tanzania***