



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/IJTDH/1904
Title of the Manuscript:	Risk factors associated with two viperid snake bites in Sri Lanka: a case control study.

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	The authors have not referred to the recent studies where most of the aims are already established. There is nothing new to establish. Conclusion is biased	Few more important recent studies were referred and cited in the article. Even though the epidemiological and risk factors related to snake bites have been described previously, those had not been proven using case control studies in the local setting.
Specific comments:	Not fit to be accepted for publication. The aims are established, data is incomplete, the references are old.	
Title and abstract		
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	- Most of the problems / aims are already established in the previous studies from Srilanka - Page 2, line 55 – replace promoted with influenced	- Even though the epidemiological factors related to snake bites have been described previously, those had not been proven using case control studies. - Corrected: “promoted” in line 53 was replaced by “influenced”
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	- The references are very old , no recent studies have been quoted - There are studies in 2008, 2009, 2010 & 2012	Corrected: New references were added.
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)	- It seems that the type of snake bite was identified on the basis of the dead snake brought by the victim's relatives. Does it mean that only those cases were recruited who brought the dead snake? If so then it should be made clear. In that case the term consecutive may not be appropriate - What was the duration from the bite to report to the hospital, were the patients conscious to answer to the questionnaire, what was the GCS at the time of admission? These data should have been mentioned - Page 3, line 77 – the word 'presented ' has been written twice	- Cases were recruited prospectively from patients with RV and HNV bites presented with offending snake. Patients who presented without the snake were not included in the study as the snake authentication could not be made. - Snake authentication was



SDI Review Form 1.5

	– remove one,	done on admission and the information for the questionnaire was collected during patients' ward stay. 3. Corrected
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	1. The data seems to be incomplete 2. Morbidity and mortality of the studied population was not mentioned? 3. On what basis was the presence of rodents in the surrounding inferred?	Necessary data were gathered on 13 risk factors selected on the basis of common knowledge and previous study findings. Results are based only on these assessed risk factors. Presence of rodents in the surrounding was inferred from the information gathered from the participants, based on their individual understanding and the experience.
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?		
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	1. The discussion has been supported by very old references 2. The authors concluded that the risk factors are easily remediable, which actually is not 3. Working in outdoor fields, occupation as field workers, low level of financial status, lack of attached toilets and presence of small rodents in the compounds. 4. One cannot change the occupation of the particular group of people. Most of the problems are inter-related which probably cannot be removed 5. The conclusion is biased	New references were included in to the text. Conclusions are completely inferred from the results. The identified significant risk factors for which the public attention is less paid, are important in planning out preventive strategies and in health education.
References		