



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_5021
Title of the Manuscript:	Community Based Monitoring under NRHM at Village Level in the State of Maharashtra, India
Type of the Article	Short Communication

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

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

- This form has total 7 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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Some unfamiliar terms need brief definitions: Page 5, line 121: Un-tied Funds Page 6, line 132-3: Scheduled Cast/Schedule Tribe category	1. One line about Un-Tied Fund is included. 2. One line about Scheduled Cast/Schedule Tribe is included.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Page 6, lines 137-8: "Prior intimation" is not understood. Perhaps replace "Prior intimation was given to the persons to be interviewed through concerned Block Health Officer/Medical Officer of Primary Health Center" with " The Block Health Officer/Medical Officer of Primary Health Center informed persons to be interviewed prior to the day of interview" or something similar. Page 6, line 145-6: The authors state that meetings were not conducted as per schedule – but nowhere have they told us what the schedule should be or how far off schedule they were. Are these the same meetings where data were collected? In the following sentence, I think that "not" should be replaced with "never" Page 8, line 175: Replace "thrust is given" with	Changed as suggested. Changed as suggested. Changed as suggested.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	“importance is placed” There are numerous other grammatical and punctuation errors that make the paper very difficult to understand in places. Hopefully, the journal can provide editing assistance, or else the authors can find someone to help them edit their work. This short communication reports results from a small (pilot?) trial of the effects of training and implementation of Community Based Monitoring (CBM) or knowledge, awareness and practices of members of Village Health Sanitation Nutrition Committees (VHSNCs) and Accredited Social Health Activists in rural villages of Maharashtra State of India. The report is generally informative, although very difficult to read because of numerous grammatical issues and the use of unfamiliar terms. The Methods, including sampling and measures, are appropriately described. The Results section could be more complete – and some results are presented in the Discussion section instead. The mean differences for VHSNC members (Table 5) were much smaller than the mean differences for ASHAs (Table 3) - and the standard deviations were similar. However, the former differences were statistically significant while the latter were not. This was primarily because the Ns were very much larger for the former comparisons. This deserves some	The paper is rewritten keeping the comments in mind. The results appearing in discussion section are relocated in result section. Comment has been included.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	comment.	
--	-----------------	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This short communication reports results from a small (pilot?) trial of the effects of training and implementation of Community Based Monitoring (CBM) or knowledge, awareness and practices of members of Village Health Sanitation Nutrition Committees (VHSNCs) and Accredited Social Health Activists in rural villages of Maharashtra State of India. The report is generally informative, although very difficult to read because of numerous grammatical issues and the use of unfamiliar terms. The Methods, including sampling and measures, are appropriately described. The Results section could be more complete – and some results are presented in the Discussion section instead. The mean differences for VHSNC members (Table 5) were much smaller than the mean differences for ASHAs (Table 3) - and the standard deviations were similar. However, the former differences were statistically significant while the latter were not. This was primarily because the Ns were very much larger for the former comparisons. This deserves some comment.	
--	---	--