SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMMR_52002**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EFFICACY OF COGNITIVE BEHAVOURAL THERAPY AND LOGOTHERAPY IN REDUCING RISKY SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR AMONG IN-SCHOOL ADOLESCENTS IN BENIN METROPOLIS EDO STATE, NIGERIA**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	**INTRODUCTION:** • The author needs to provides more discussion on these two concepts: COGNITIVE BEHAVOURAL THERAPY AND LOGOTHERAPY. The problem is not coming out clearly especially with regard to measures adopted in the area of study are used to minimize or reduce cases of adolescents. • Acknowledge sources so that the study is not allegation based. • What is in-school and how they susceptible to the stated problem. This should be defined to show why the group. • Is purpose of the study important in this case when you have research questions and hypothesis? It has to show whether you are presenting objectives or purpose • **METHODOLOGY** • The author hasn't shown how 145 sample was arrived considering the target population was large at 20420 and how distribution was made in 31 mixed public senior school. • The methodology section needs more discussion for clarity. • **RESULTS** • Check interpretation of findings especially on p-value… *Since the alpha level (0.05) is less than the p-value of .130.* *(line 229/230)* • Check overall presentation of results and discussion. P-value, alpha level needs to be discussion. Results of hypothesis 1, 2… • Discussions, conclusions and recommendations should be based on the data analysed. •	Agree with the reviewer Most of the corrections effected Corrected where necessited
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)*	