

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_110731
Title of the Manuscript:	Liquid-based cytology profile of street sex workers in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1- Yes, studies using new diagnostic screening methods are important and the topic in question in this article still requires much investigation.</p> <p>2- Yes, this is in line with the study proposal.</p> <p>3- Yes, it is structured and enlightening for a first assessment.</p> <p>4- Yes, no comments.</p> <p>5- Yes, both the writing and the methods applied are in accordance with the study proposal.</p> <p>6- Regarding references, I suggest that more recent articles be introduced, I found that the majority of citations are from more than 5 years ago, and as this is a more recent diagnostic evaluation proposal and raises correlations with HPV, I suggest that more recent articles are introduced into the text.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>In my reading, I found no grammatical difficulties in interpreting it and I consider it accordingly.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I consider it an important topic and, in addition, a study audience that is difficult to attract, therefore, it can bring new scientific perspectives.</p> <p>After reading the text, I realize that it is an important topic and an audience that is difficult to analyze. The study methodology is current and there are still many gaps to be filled in the literature that deals with the investigation, therefore, it is a current discussion. However, I found that the vast majority of bibliographic references are more than five years old, which may influence the discussion of the work and thus the conclusions. Therefore, I suggest that greater attention be paid to this point.</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:	Alexandre Cândido da Silva
Department, University & Country	College of Dentistry, São Caetano do Sul University, Brazil