

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes. Particularly because of the findings. No. The cytological profile is not described (The Bethesda System recommended) and only concludes in chronic cervicitis. “HPV incidence in SSWs in Benin City, Nigeria and social background” Any way the data obtained easily can give the cytological profile, and viral status. Despite typing for hrHPV. And can be complemented in the context description. No. It could if data is properly described. Yes, is just how data is described and analysed, References are more based in demographic and social background of SSWs rather than discussing the reason or cause of that low incidence in HPV status. No mention if any were vaccinated. In HPV status is important not only use absolute data but associate with percentage.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript should review besides what us in their discussion the profile of SSXs of social and biological background. The findings of low incidence of HPV infection, contrarily to beliefs that is an important factor of STDs is lifestyle and promiscuity. Which is important in bacterial and other microorganisms. With that discussion the manuscript should be relevant. I am not ruling out what are written in the manuscript but needs to widen up the other issues and what is in there is a complementary and important. Data.	Authors wish to state that most of the factors mentioned by the reviewers are beyond the scope of the study. They could however be considered in subsequent studies.

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No ethical issues