



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:		
Specific comments:	This study aimed at identifying environmental and behavioral risk factors of victims of the two more medically relevant viperid snakes in Sri Lanka. Due to the low sample size, the authors conducted a statistical univariate analysis and conclude that the majority of the patients were middle aged males belonging to the lower income group. They also conclude that most viperid bites had occurred in outdoor places whilst victims were not wearing protective foot wear and also during field works. However, they also noticed that not using protective wear was not significant. This finding seems to be at odds with the previous conclusion, and deserves thus an explanation. On the other hand, several risk factors seem to be highly correlated, i.e., victims bitten during field works may overlap the low income group, and thus a multivariate analysis should be conducted. The limited sample size hampered this type of analysis and the whole study should be considered preliminar. In addition, the authors conclude that the risk factors identified are easily remediable and would be useful in health education in preventing snake bites. It is easy to state "this would be useful in...", but authors should be more precise suggesting concrete measures that, in their opinion, should be implemented to effectively prevent snake bites.	Not using protective wear was not significant and it was corrected. Further the respective sentence in the discussion was revised. The limitation of the study was the sample size. If the study had a larger sample the results would have been more precise, with narrow SD values. Also this fact limited application of multivariate analysis. However, study of this nature will pave the way for future studies.
Title and abstract		
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	YES	-
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	YES	-
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)	Given the small sample size, a univariate analysis is appropriate. However, the subject under study would need a multivariate analysis.	-
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.	Too preliminary (see specific comments)	



SDI Review Form 1.5

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?)		
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	NO	-
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)	Partly (see specific comments)	-
References		