

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_94307
Title of the Manuscript:	FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR AMONG ADOLESCENTS IN CHIPATA DISTRICT, ZAMBIA
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:

(<https://www.journali-srr.com/index.php/I-SRR/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Abstract is the eye of the article hence, it should be packed with information, the problem statement in brief, objectives, results showing the statistics, and also the recommendations. Most importantly fill out the gap the study sought to fill. 2. The Introduction should have started from a global perspective to regional to- national perspective and also highlighting the gaps from those studies so that the Author justifies the study. The Researcher could also use different policies on sexual and reproductive health and also highlight the gaps. 3. As much as literature review is important, the Author could also make use of a conceptual framework. 4. The Methodology section was inadequately prepared. The methodology should be explained so that no one questions the selection criteria. 5. Results should be clearly explained. The Researcher should avoid lumping results together. 6. The Discussion sessions should be linked to the then literature review and should discuss the results showing similarities, differences and corroboration between the study findings and the literature. Lastly, the Author should answer the so-what question, that is, what recommendations does the author proffer on the findings. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The area is well researched by other authors, so what gap was the Author trying to fill. 2. The Author should have triangulated qualitative and quantitative research methods for better analysis. 	

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Participants aged are still considered minors, did the Author seek consent from the parents of guardians?</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Andrea Toweka
Department, University & Country	University of Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe