

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International STD Research &amp; Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_I-SRR_100313</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Prevalence of Trichomonas vaginalis infection among women of reproductive age in Anambra State, South Eastern, Nigeria</b>
Type of the 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  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>1. Yes, this type of research helps the scientific community for better therapeutic outcomes as empirical therapy, improves sexually transmitted diseases and reproductive health.</b>  <b>2.If researchers take data from limited hospitals, it does represent the whole population so it is better entitled "To study <i>Trichomonas vaginalis</i> infection among women of reproductive age in Anambra State, South Eastern, Nigeria</b>  <b>3. Method was unnecessarily elaborate in the abstract it was better to rewrite it.</b>  <b>4. Yes, the Structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</b>  <b>5. Yes manuscript is scientifically correct.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Naba Raj Bastola</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Paschimanchal Community Hospital, Nepal</b>