



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
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>
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	The manuscript is important considering the dengue as a main public health problem in different parts of the world. However, is necessary some revision in English Language and some added at discussion to make more interesting the finds of the paper. 1- The keywords could change, at least, the order for dengue prevention, health education, school health; 2- In the Methods the Authors could make clear how was calculated the knowledge score, Topic 2.4;	1. We agree and have changed the order of key words 2. We have improved section 2.4 by adding the following statement. "Additionally, 9 of the questions required 'true', 'false', or 'don't know' answers while the rest were multiple choice questions that required identifying correct answers". We have also clarified further by stating that "One point was given



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3- In Table 1 the annual income should be converted for US dollar, this will make easier compare between different countries with same problems; 4- Topic 3.3 the numbers showed of caretakers was 625, is lower than 634 that was returned (in other parts is showed 627);	for each correct response and a wrong or 'don't know' response obtained a score of 0" We had already described how we obtained the overall knowledge score in section 2.5 "Scores for each knowledge and attitude item were summed, and the median value was used to create a dichotomous variable of high and low knowledge level". 3. We agree and have converted to income to US dollars in all the tables and text. 4. 627 are those who responded to all the knowledge questions while 625 are those who responded to all the attitude questions. The attitude score was calculated for those who responded to all the questions. We have modified this statement to read "A total of 625 caretakers responded to all the attitude questions (response rate 97.7%)"
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	5- In the Discussion Authors make good points about similar results in different parts in the world but they should discuss more their finds, for example in the Table 5 the Education and use of mosquito repellent was not positively related and was not discussed.	5. We have improved the discussion. We have discussed the lack of association between use of repellents and education and income. We have also added new references. We have added the following statement in the paragraph 6 of the discussion “We did not find education or income to be associated with use of mosquito repellents. These findings are surprising but reveal that use of repellents was not influenced by affordability or the education status of respondents but rather by the working environment. On the contrary, a study in Pakistan found that individuals in higher socio-economic groups had better dengue preventive practices”
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		