



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 <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	1. In general, the manuscript is lacking citation of references. For example, The whole "Introduction" section does not have any single citation of reference, which is very unlikely. An specific example could be: at end of the first sentence (on line 61) there should be a citation. Similarly, lack of referencing in general throughout the manuscript is a major area to improve. 2. Texts in "Introduction" section (FROM line 70: "A total of 5 districts.... TO line 73: for actual implementation of the project") should be shifted to "Method" section 3. "Un-tied fund" is highlighted as key word, also appeared in the text in Results and Discussion – but authors didn't mention anything about it. Also the importance of un-tied fund utilization in the introduction is necessary to understand the result mentioned in the article 4. In "Introduction" Authors should provide rationale of the study and should highlight the use of the study results 5. It is not clear why lines 99-105 are under "study location" section 6. "Selection of villages" should have the texts from "Introduction" section (as mentioned in # 2) 7. Line 122 mentioned "separate scoring systems were also developed...." But didn't clarify the system neither mentioned how the scoring system was developed nor provided any relevant reference. It is important to describe the study and analysis procedures in detail –	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	so that other researchers can replicate the study if needed. 8. In Line 136 it is mentioned: “In the field visits they were accompanied by their teachers”. Does it imply that teacher’s presence had any influence (positive or negative) on quality of collected data ? Why it is mentioned here? 9. In line 137 it is mentioned: “Prior information was given to the person to be interviewed..” in connection to this – the query is: - What procedure was followed to identify the person to be interviewed? Procedure for selecting villages are described but the procedure of selecting the person to interview was not described - how many of selected/identified persons were NOT found while data collecting team visited the village? Was NOT FOUND interviewee replaced by another interviewee? If yes – HOW? 9. “Process and Analysis” should mention what statistical methods were conducted, which statistical tests were employed and what was the statistical significance level set for these analyses. 10. “Results” section should be rewritten. It is not clear why the lines 144-146 are placed under this section 11. Table 1 and 2 were referred nowhere in the result section; neither these tables mentioned nor clarified in the text 12. Tables 3, 4 and 5 were mentioned in the text in Result section – but without any description/detailing of major finding from these tables. 13. “Discussion” section is completely lacking any flow of text/topics. Authors should specifically focus on major findings from the study in this section. And then they should make citation/reference from existing evidences /literature to compare their findings/results. If this study	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	shows difference – authors should explain possible reasons of such difference. This kind of discussion is completely absent in this manuscript. Authors should present what they have found in existing literature on this subject/topic and if nothing does exist – that is also important to report. 14. Lines 193-196 should be part of “Results” section 15. In the beginning of line 204 Z value is reported whereas in table 5 it is mentioned as RD (without mentioning what does RD stand for) 16. “Conclusion” should be data driven and based on observed findings of the study – not author’s assumption/opinion (example : Line 226-228 appears as Authors’ opinion or assumption) 17. Conclusion in the text and in the abstract are much different ! Authors should focus on this area of keeping consistency throughout the manuscript texts 18. “Limitations” came in this manuscript after “Conclusion” which is not expected. Usually strength and limitation of a study both are mentioned as part of discussion. And besides mentioning the strength and limitations, authors should specify how did they ensure quality of results they observed in spite of these notes limitations (in this manuscript this is absent; authors just mentioned the limitation but did not clarify whether this limitation affects their results from this study or not) 19. “References” cited should be checked carefully. For example: cited reference # 2 (line 187) does not appear relevant to the text. Further literature review might help the authors to rewrite the “Introduction” and “Discussion” sections	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	1. On Line 31: instead of “Maharastra State of...” should be “State of Maharastra” 2. On line 36: instead of “control” – “comparison” would be a better word 3. On line 73: “At village level” these words are redundant	
Optional/General comments	Further work on organizing the write-up to smooth the flow and copyediting is necessary. Authors mentioned that “The proposal was discussed in the meeting of Ethical Committee of State Health System Resource Center, NRHM, Government of Maharashtra and then exempted from review.” Does it imply Approval from the Ethical committee?	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammad Rasheduzzaman Shah
Department, University & Country	Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins School of Public Health, USA