



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_10265
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF PERSONAL HYGIENE AND OF HEALTH STATUS OF STREET- FOOD VENDORS IN YAOUNDÉ (CAMEROON)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I propose this Title : Assessment of Hygiene Practices and of Health Status of Street-Food Vendors in Yaoundé (Cameroon) In summary, the study authors justify the difficulties encountered by staff and students in their diet due to changes in work schedules; but there is not only staff and students. In big cities, almost everyone (students, civil servants, traders, workers etc.) eats on street foods due course distance workplaces houses, but also because of poverty, because at lower cost, you can easily feed into the street. Therefore authors should take into account all aspects to define the context of street foods. At the end of introduction, although the study is interested in personal hygiene for street food, there is no only staff to evaluate, but also the environment preparation and sale, equipment, raw materials etc. Materials and Methods: There is too much literature in the materials and methods section.	Adopted. Thanks OK. Of course, but in this draft, we did focus on staff



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Authors we must begin by 2.2 Study areas. Furthermore, the research methodology of parasites has not been described. For staff, it was also working on the sputum to detect TB. It was also salmonella to research. Result and Discussion: There are too many comments in the results section. Authors should only present the results and comment the tables without discussions. Conclusion: Authors should not cite references in their conclusion. the conclusion should be short to learn from the results and give advice to vendors, consumers and authorities in charge of hygiene. About bibliography, the citation does not show recent work. There is much recent work on the street foods that authors can find.	We could not avoid definition of those 2 main concepts. Readers need to understand what we mean by personal hygiene and health status in our study Due to financial constraints, we could not extend to TB detection, Salmonella and so on. We don't think so. We just commented so that readers who are familiar with, could get what we are talking about. It is required to restrict references and not to absolutely avoid OK. An attempt has been done to update some references
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There are ethical question. Authors should consider the consent of sellers before medical tests	This has been done as you are stating