

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_91515
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge And Management Of Sexually Transmitted Infections By General Practitioners Of Lahore
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	<p>This is a good work but need some modifications in my opinion as the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The aim of study not clear and not written .The author write only study objectives. 2- The introduction very short paragraphs and not enough 3- You must write study recommendation based on study. 4- The instruments for data collection not clear 5- How did you measured study sample's knowledge? 6- There are no table clarifying level of study sample's knowledge regarding STDs and management? 7- Regarding discussion, the author not covers all result items and this section requires major revision. The discussion did not flow as should. There is poor general logic and justifications of interpretations 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The study objectives not matching with research title and the aim The references very old and many of them have not year Please rewrite the references and used modern references The recommendations must be written in the study abstract based on study results.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The aim of the study not clear Sampling technique and setting for implementing the study not clear The discussion did not flow as should. There is poor general logic and justifications of interpretations</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abeer Mohammed El-Maghawery Eldeeb
Department, University & Country	Damietta University, Egypt