

Paper: "Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice of Academic Students about STIs and HIV/AIDS at the University of Fianarantsoa: A Cross-Sectional Study"

Submitted: 22 July 2022 Accepted: 18 January 2023 Published: 31 January 2023

Corresponding Author: Andriamamonjisoa Andriamizaka Johary

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n3p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Nawal S. Faris Zarqa University, Jordan



ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: aug 03	Date Review Report Submitted: aug 03		
Manuscript Title: University students dealing with sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS: knowledge and practice, a cross-sectional study conducted in Fianarantsoa, Madagascar.			
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0803/22			
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No			
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes			

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2
(Please insert your comments) The title, objectives and conclusion are not in the same line	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
(Please insert your comments) The title, objectives and conclusion are not in the same line	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
(Please insert your comments)	
There are many grammatical errors and also spelling mistakes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
The methods are not clearly reported. The major limitation of this study is the data	ne tool used for getting
There are some publications in this regard where authors can get information. Th validated; therefore, it is the great limitations of this study from my point of view	e questionnaire is not
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
The results report did not follow the STORBE guidelines	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
The title, objectives and conclusion are not in the same line	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
there are different letters in cites, some are capital and the other not	
there are references that cannot be found	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	X

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Although the study is very interesting, its greatest limitation, unfortunately, is the non-validated questionnaire, which weakens its external validity.

Manuscript attached with change tracking

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Although the study is very interesting, its greatest limitation, unfortunately, is the non-validated questionnaire, which weakens its external validity.

