Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJMPCP_85137**
Title of the Manuscript:	**KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICE OF PELVIC INFLAMMATORY DISEASE PREVENTION AMONG FEMALE STUDENTS IN COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCE, NIGER DELTA UNIVERSITY, BAYELSA STATE, NIGERIA**
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.journalajmpcp.com/index.php/AJMPCP/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.6

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	**Comment from reviewer** **Title of Manuscript: Not well written** **1. Recommended to include Year of the study** **Abstract: Not well written** **1. Introduction: No need to highlighted too much of literature in Abstract** **2. Method section: suppose is the "Cross sectional study" and suggested to date of data collection, sample size, instruments used and cut-off for knowledge/practices.** **3. Finding: Suggested to highlighted the important finding and socio-demography findings not consider important.** **4. Conclusion is missing, please add.** **Introduction: Not well written** **1. The explaination in first paragraph too long, suggest to summarize by half?** **2. Suggest to include knowledge and practice literature in the introduction section to substantiate the need to conduct this study.** **3. Please clarify this statement "in the College of Health Sciences, Niger Delta University, it is observed that some females suffer from pelvic inflammatory disease".** **MethodNot well written** **1. The "cross sectional" is the correct term instead of descriptive design** **2. No need to describe this design in depth. The term Cross sectional will do.** **3. Please clarify which sampling technique used? convenience or random?** **4. No need to explain in detailed the instruments theory and recommended to highlighted whether the instruments is validated or not?. The instruments should be validated if first time developed by researcher.** **Results: Not well written** **1. Please clarify how to assess the knowledge or practices ? any cut-off value for Low or high ?** **Discussion: Not well written** **1. The discussion section should be the discuss of the findings and not repeated the findings of the study.** **2. Recommended not to include the findings of the study in discussion section.** **Conclusion Recommendation Not well written** **1. Please compare with your problem statement in the Introduction. Look like it is contradicted between each other** **2. Please clarify why wearing condom and not other is your recommendation?** **3. Recommended to include the ethical approval ID number in this section** **References:Not well written** **1. The reference must follow the index medicus style of reference writing. (refer on how to write abbrevation for journal)**	

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Lim Kuang Kuay**
Department, University & Country	**Institute for Public Health, National Institutes of Health, Malaysia**