



SDI Review Form 1.6

tPART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/IJTDH/2110
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of field performance of insecticide-treated mosquito nets in north-western Burkina Faso

General guideline: Reviewers are requested to follow these guidelines during review: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- Introduction *(Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined? **The problem is very important in this area highly endemic for malaria, objective well defined**)*
- 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)*
- Results & discussion *(Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust **Yes**? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion **Yes**. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures **No**. Biased claims should be pointed out **Yes**. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper **Yes**? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out **Yes**?)*
- 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)*
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate **No**? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)</i>
<u>COMPULSORY REVISION</u> comments	Reliable data on evaluation of field performance of Insecticides Treated bed Nets (ITNs) presented here are very valuable, especially in areas that remain underdocumented such as those highly endemic for malaria. This work is so great and important that it needs to be acknowledged. However, I have a number of concerns about it that I would like to express through the following comments: First, It is true that large scale use of ITNs is the strategy recommended by the WHO to limit malaria transmission, but Pyrethroid resistance is widespread across malaria vector populations, particularly the Kdr mutation which confers cross-resistance to all pyrethroids and may threaten the efficacy of ITNs. For this reason, it would be interesting if you could state in which conditions the nets have been distributed in Burkina Faso particularly in the study areas, giving data on the nets coverage, usage, time of distribution and conditions of acquisition. It is also good if you could describe the effect of bed nets difference of distribution between the three study areas, then tell whether Deltametrin is the only Pyrethroid insecticide approved for treating nets in study area as well as whether any study has been conducted about the impact of nets distribution on the malaria transmission in Burkina Faso Secondly I observed that there not any data concerning the vector presence and distribution in the study areas such as number of <i>An. gambiae</i> sl collected, variability of <i>An. gambiae</i> sl in the tree areas in terms of temporal and geographical distribution and/or prevalence Last, I observe that the discussion is rather weak and not convincing, with a number of inferences that are not directly supported by the data. Therefore, in light of all the above, I would encourage the authors to seriously re-think the interpretation of their	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	data, paying attention not to over-interpret their findings and keeping on focus	
Minor REVISION comments	1) Abstract a) RESULTS: To specify the specie of mosquito (<i>Anopheles gambiae sl.</i>) b) To harmonize ITNs and ITN (spelling) 2) Introduction • Line 43 = Mueller et al.2007 : reference not cited • Line 43 and 44 -coverage was 28% in 2007 (Mueller et al.2001) = study in 2007 and reference 2001 • Line 44- re-examine (figure):1 • Line 47 : number of figure • Line 48 : countries bordering the map of the study area would be very much welcome • Line 62 and 63 : error 3) RESULTS AND DICUSSION • Line 69 : number of table • Line 70 : number of table • Table : Please also include data for An gambiae sl. mortality after 24h REFERENCES • Line 124: <i>Anopheles gambiae s.l.</i> • Line 127: <i>Anopheles gambiae s.l.</i>	
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer