

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_95996
Title of the Manuscript:	Daily oral Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis uptake, adherence and retention among Female Sex Workers in the Greater Gaborone City, Botswana
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>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript addresses an up-to-date theme of great magnitude and relevance for the elaboration, planning and implementation of public policies in the context of Sexually Transmitted Infections, mainly in the approach of key populations, such as female sex workers. Still, how important it is to know the factors that influence the adherence and retention of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) to HIV in this population group.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the study requires greater clarity and coherence in the textual organization, as well as further clarification regarding the methodology and, therefore, it can be replicated/disseminated.</p> <p>Thus, the introduction should be revised with greater power of synthesis and present the justification and relevance of the study; as for the method, there was a lack of clarity, detailing and textual organization of information; the results require more textual organization in the presentation; the discussion, more objectivity in response to the purpose of the study, textual organization and critical positioning of the authors; and, finally, the conclusion does not respond to the proposed objective.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Yes. 	<p>TITLE: ok</p> <p>ABSTRACT: Authors are advised to provide more concise and clear information. The objective differs from that presented in the introduction. Review the verbal form used. Avoid the use of acronyms in the abstract. Ex: pre-PrEP, FSWs, SSPS. Describe where data was collected and who this population/sample is. It is suggested that the authors review the study design, as they state that an analysis of association was carried out in the methodology. The results respond, in part, to the findings of the study. Review the textual form of presentation of these findings. Avoid using acronyms in the abstract, MTS, FSWs. It is suggested that the authors describe how this analysis of adherence to PrEP was done, they point out 72.9%, but it is not clear how this calculation was done. A validated instrument was used to verify adherence. Describe in the methodology item. Not located in the results for the 18 to 29 age group. The conclusion does not include the findings of the studies.</p> <p>Keywords: Correct descriptor: Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis, Retention in Care. It is suggested to include the descriptors, namely: Medication Adherence, Women, Working.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION: The authors approach the theme in context with the international scene, as well as bring studies about the theme in scene. Review more up-to-date data regarding studies that address the topic. It is worth mentioning the use of the abbreviations IST and DST, because sometimes it uses one, sometimes the other. Use the most up-to-date IST. Also, review the use of acronyms throughout the text, such as HIV, PrEP, FSWs, being the first use of the term. State justification and relevance of the study.</p> <p>In the paragraphs, "Studies have also examined whether people on PrEP...", "The study showed the uptake of oral PrEP increased over 50%...", "Studies have recommended PrEP for all people at high-risk..." which studies were these, localization? In "The report of the TWG indicated over 80% of FSWs who believed they would adequately adhere to PrEP..." who is the author?</p> <p>OBJECTIVE: to review the form presented in the abstract and in the introduction, since it differs.</p> <p>METHOD: It is suggested that the authors describe how the data collection was carried out, as they do not describe the collection site, how the subjects were approached, they also mention that they were tested for STIs, as well as laboratory tests, but not mentioning details of this collect.</p> <p>Also, how this sampling was done. The authors do not detail the 'n'. Better define the sampling of the study, was it census or for convenience?</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Authors are suggested to define acceptance, adherence and retention used in this study, as a basis for studies. The authors only bring the definition used in the study, but not their authorship.</p> <p>Which paragraph reference “Gaborone is the capital and largest city in Botswana. The population of Gaborone is approximately 232,000 with more than 10%...”.</p> <p>It is suggested to remove the section, 'to assess the uptake, adherence and retention of FSWs in the PrEP programme'. Review the type of study, cross-sectional analysis.</p> <p>Better define the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the study. Were trans women, pregnant women included or not? The authors state that adherence to oral medication, PrEP, was evaluated; however, they do not mention which instrument was used for evaluation, is this instrument validated? Still, you suggest organizing the variables of the data collection instrument, since it differs from those presented in the data analysis. Review and organize by category.</p> <p>The authors state that data regarding the PrEP number or code, PrEP start date and discontinuation were collected, but this information is not available in the results.</p> <p>Which statistical program was used for data analysis? Review the $p < 0.05$. Review the textual form of the P value, according to the journal's guidelines. P is always italicized and capitalized.</p> <p>i) Correct expression: ($P = .05$). Wrong Expression: ($P < .05$), unless $P < .001$.</p> <p>RESULTS: Put the relative and absolute frequency in all findings. Authors are suggested to organize and concise the information, with greater clarity. In the excerpt, 'Similarly, single FSWs, unemployed and citizens adhered more to the programme'. This is about discussion, not results. It is suggested to withdraw. The authors place an age group of 13 to 30 years; however, this age group is not included in the table. It is suggested to remove the section, Information on seco-status was missing for all categories. Review the p value, which differs from that shown in Table 3, in the section to PrEP ($p < 0.049$).</p> <p>DISCUSSION: It is suggested to start the discussion with a response to the purpose of the study, and its main findings. Then point out and discuss the main findings without repeating information about the results. Prioritize objectivity, clarity and conciseness with the intercalation of the findings in this study, with the literature, and with the critical position of the authors in the face of the findings. Still, it is suggested to remove the categorization of the findings in the discussion. In the excerpt (It can however, be argued that the low uptake of PrEP could be a result of the perceptions of being not at risk and low knowledge about the benefits of PrEP in this high risk to HIV infection population), the authors argue these factors for low adherence; however, this was the study's findings for low adherence to the program. Review. In the paragraph, “We found high adherence to PrEP among participants with secondary education. This finding...” What does the literature address regarding these findings? We did not find these findings in the results of this study (That study reported that some sex workers were willing to use PrEP if it had limited side effects and could be used intermittently). Review.</p> <p>CONCLUSION: It does not answer the objective of the study. Objectivity and conciseness are suggested in view of the main findings.</p> <p>REFERENCES 34.8% correspond to the last five years (2018-2022). Also, review the formatting in accordance with the journal's guidelines.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Braulio Vieira de Sousa Borges</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Federal University of Piaui, Brazil</p>