

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_95750
Title of the Manuscript:	Bacterial vaginosis: Prevalence and risk factors among women in Dakar, Senegal
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.journalajrid.com/index.php/AJRID/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is of medium range importance. It does not revolutionize the topic but instead adds its data do the general knowledge. Yes Yes Yes Yes The references seems appropriate, but should be checked (see my comments below). 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The English quality is suitable in my own opinion. Additional minor revision comments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The data presented in Table 1 are divided in several sections (age group, parity ...). Did the author check if no interesting link could be established between these sections? For example, is there a difference in the BV % for women of the same age and parity but with a different history of infections that cannot be observed in another age group? Such analyses can be tedious but can easily be summarized if no difference is observed or could add interesting data to the manuscript is such differences are indeed observed. Could the authors homogenize their writing of in-text references? Sometimes the year is noted, sometimes it is not. The authors should also check their in-text references vs their reference list. On page 7, the sentence "Conversely, Joesoef found that BV was significantly associated with IUDs (1)." does not seem to be linked to any reference in the reference list. Could the authors use a more scientific term than "breeding ground" in the discussion section? I guess they mean biofilms. In that case, it would be best to use the proper term and add a reference on that subject (numerous ones are available). The link between these two sentences is unclear at the end of the discussion section: "While contributing to the strengthening of biological and epidemiological knowledge about BV, our study nevertheless has some limitations. Indeed, the clinical information of the patients as well as their intimate habits could help to better understand the occurrence of BV.". They seem to contradict each other. Could the authors manage a better transition? The conclusion section should mention the geographic area targeted by the study. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>No additional comment.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olivier Thellin
Department, University & Country	University of Liege, Belgium