

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-abstract- better to write again by incorporating numbers/percentages/confidence intervals.</li> <li>-introduction-- to many points taken from one references and the flow s not clear. Moreover the authors didn't show the problem clearly and why the this research needed? Too many points for one variable/issue.</li> <li>-The author uses references for a long number of paragraphs. Moreover, smilar references were cited consecutively which s not necessary.</li> <li>-A lot of points have been taken from one references.</li> <li>- better to review more references to show the evidences.</li> <li>-Still the signification of justification of the research is not clearly stated.</li> <li>-Methods expand well. I have doubt on the tool validity data collection procedure .. quality of data...sample Size... and ethical issues.</li> <li>- Results- there are sensitive questions and way of putting the result has be revised.</li> <li>- discussion- the findings are not well discussed. There was discussion out of the findings and better to follow out key findings when discussing it. Still this section neds great revision.</li> <li>-References – to many points from one references... one reference used many times....similar references cited consecutively.... Very old references used ... need great revision.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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>There research has sensitive questions and I doubt on the ethical sues. Where the authors get the ethical clearance? Who were the data collectors? Etc. a lot of points are rase n the manuscript?</p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Keflie Yohannes Gebresilassie
Department, University & Country	University of Gondar, Ethiopia