Reviewer’s report

Title: Russian nursing students' knowledge level and attitudes in the context of HIV

Version: 4 Date: 14 March 2014

Reviewer: Ganga Mahat

Reviewer's report:

Dear authors:
This study is important and timely. Since there seems to be limited studies done in Russian and the incidence rate is increasing, the findings of the study will make educators aware of the need for including more HIV/AIDS information on the curriculum to prepare nursing students better.
However, the manuscript needs a major revision and editing. See comments below and on the manuscript too.

Title: OK
Abstract: Clear and informative. Minor revision needed on the “method” and “conclusion” sections (see comments on the manuscript)
Background: Background section is too long and confusing to read. Need to shorten this section by removing unnecessary information and may be by using subheadings. Subheadings could be Introduction, Background, literature review, and background of nursing program in Russia.
Purpose of the study: Clearly stated.
Research questions: OK. Minor suggestions (see comments of the manuscript).
Methods- Use of subheadings such as sample, instrument, data collection procedure, instrument, and data analysis will be good
Data collection/Sample- OK, need few clarification. Add a new subheading for instrument (see comments of the manuscript). Reliability of the attitude instrument was provided but the reliability of knowledge questionnaire was not included.
Under instrument, the information are scattered and unclear; need to organize information better. For example, first say that the questionnaire consisted of 3 sections: a) demographic background, b) Knowledge questions, and c) attitude questions. Then explain about each one.
Statistical analysis- Use of descriptive statistics to report knowledge and attitude was good. What type of analysis was used to answer research questions 2 and 4. I am not clear about the use of logistic regression analysis to analyze individual score.
Ethics- OK
Results: See comments on the manuscripts. The report of HIV/AIDS knowledge needs to be rewritten clearly and in organized fashion. Why Table 1 represents only a part of the knowledge questions? If you are reporting according to different sections of the knowledge question (immunology, modes of transmission, disease etiology, risk and universal precaution, make it clear for the readers. I would also like to know how many items are in each.

Findings of students’ attitudes were written well. Only not clear why only few attitudes items were included in Table 2.

Discussion This section is written fairly well however, it needs to be edited and information needs to be organized so that it flows well.

Make a subheading or “Limitation” and place it after the discussion.

Conclusion- OK

Table: Whatever you are reporting in Table I and Table 2, make sure the title of the table indicates that. For example, Percentages of students’ correct responses on…..

Reference: 70% of the references are older than 5 years. I suggest to update the references.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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