



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_6390
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge, attitude, and practices related to dengue among caretakers of elementary school children in Chanthaburi Province, Thailand
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	If there was no standard questionnaire regionally or internationally, why did the author not adopt the questionnaire used by the Kamphaeng Phet Study, with as it would possibly enable to resolve the conflicting conclusions within the same country? Civil servants does not denote any particular occupation, it ranges from a guard to a professional e.g. scientist/ doctor. Similarly the classification of occupation housewife/husband does not make sense. Husband is not an occupation. Line 15: Severe dengue includes DHF and Dengue Shock Syndrome or alternatively the new WHO classification is DF, dengue with warning signs and severe dengue.	We developed our questionnaire by consulting different sources including the Kamphaeng Phet study. The target population for the Kamphaeng Phet study was the general population; which is different from ours. We agree with the reviewer. However, since the numbers were too few (n=40), we decided to classify all as civil servants. We have added this footnote under the tables to clarify this “this includes different occupations categories all amalgamated due to small numbers” We agree with the reviewer and we have replaced this with unemployed in the text and tables. We agree. We have modified this stamen to read “Its clinical presentations vary from asymptomatic infection to classical dengue fever (DF) and to more severe forms of dengue haemorrhagic fever (DHF) and dengue shock syndrome (DSS)”. Additionally we have moved this sentence ahead of the one which was right in front of it.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 26: Dengue prevention includes clearing the breeding grounds around the homes, emptying cans/containers of water lying around the homes and surrounding community besides just applying insect repellent. Would per capita income be a better reflection of income disparity then household income? In a large family, household income would be meaningless compared to a small nuclear family with modest income. Line 117 does not make sense- the odds of having more knowledge did not differ across the other occupations when compared to being a farm labourer.	We agree with the reviewer that there are other interventions for dengue control. In this paper, we looked at whether there were open water containers outside the house and if yes, whether there was fish in the water container. We also focused on applying insect repellent and used this as an outcome variable in the analysis of determinants of dengue related practice. We have inserted the following statement in the discussion to highlight this weakness. <i>“Although there are a number of dengue prevention practices, we only assessed two: use of larvicides or fish to control the breeding of mosquitoes in water containers lying in the compound and the application of repellents. It is possible that participants were involved in other dengue prevention practices that the study did not capture”</i> We agree with the reviewer that per capita income is a better reflection of income disparity than household income. However we did not collect data on the household size and hence we can’t estimate this variable. We however think that this has not weakened our findings given the dose response relationship between income and knowledge and hence both approaches are likely to lead us to the same conclusion. We have revised this sentence to read <i>“However, there were no significant differences in the odds of having high knowledge across other occupations with reference to being a farm labourer”</i>.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 99-101 does not make sense. Please delete it. <i>Line 108-grammatical error-it should be knowledge of geography</i>	Agreed. The statement has been deleted Agreed. We have revised this sentence to read “Knowledge of geographic and seasonal variations of dengue was reported.....”
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	What are the specific methods do the author suggest to target the population at risk. What is the current media message and how can the content of the message be more widely understand to the at risk population. E.g. use of narratives of victims and the pitfalls and lessons that could be learned from it.	