



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_11897
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the attitude and perception of community members and health workers regarding leprosy stigma
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 <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	<p>Thank you for editorial committee for invitation me to review this manuscript. The study aimed to measure the attitudes and the perception of community members and health workers towards leprosy and to provide baseline data for those who are interested in launching de-stigmatizing interventions through mix-method study (qualitative and quantitative approaches). Patients, community members and health workers were recruited to the study. Authors have used to gather data questionnaires and focal groups discussion.</p> <p>General Comments: This study is very interesting and well done.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for such valuable and encouraging suggestions. We appreciated this very much.</p>
	<p>Specific Comments: I am not sure what “comparative study” means. It would be interesting if the authors could introduce a reference about it. I suggest to the authors to review the study design, considering the reference of Creswell: Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the study design and replaced ‘comparative study’ with ‘cross-sectional survey using mixed methods’. Please see text with turquoise highlight.</p>
	<p>I think that authors should review the objective of the abstract considering the objective in the end of the introduction. The methodology abstract also should be reviewed, it is important to include the</p>	<p>Revised accordingly. Please see text with turquoise highlight.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>statistical significance level defined to the study. Results could have only a brief description of the contents of the paper with more objective results (e.g. “Most of members”, it is too subjective, I think that is better to replace it with absolute numbers and percentage). I’ve still observed in the abstract (Fourth line of the results) that results were not clear, the authors should review them: “...Community members and health workers perceived leprosy as.... (How many of them? Everyone? It sounds as a generalization, caution with generalizations in this type of study).</p>	
	<p>Introduction:</p> <p>The introduction is well structured with relevant literature review, however it would be interesting to include what is the concept of “stigma” assumed for this study.</p>	<p>Introduction:</p> <p>Included the definition of ‘stigma’ accordingly. Please see text with turquoise highlight.</p>
	<p>Line 13, the authors claimed that leprosy incidence has declined; however they did not present incidence coefficients. I am not sure what 405 detected cases represent in epidemiologic terms; I think that incidence coefficients are better in this case.</p>	<p>The number or rate of newly detected leprosy cases is used as a proxy indicator of incidence. This is because it is not possible to assess the true incidence in leprosy due to its long incubation period (up to more than 10 years).</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 24: Authors reported that many attempts have been made to reduce stigma and they only pointed one strategy, it would be interesting that authors could explain others beyond of integration of health care services..	We also mentioned other strategies in line 27-29 of original manuscript.
	Material and Methods: Line 46: I suggest to the authors to review the “comparative research”, because this is not understandable to readers. I wonder to know what comparative research means.	We omitted a term ‘comparative’ in line 26 as the rest of this line has already elaborated the study design.
	Line 66: I am not sure about the sampling with quantitative data, what is minimum sample for each community members or health workers population? I think that is 236, but it was not clear in the casuistic. Maybe authors might restructure the method by parts/subsections, considering initially information about the study design, population and sample, procedures to collect data and measures tool, analysis data and ethics statement. There is none information if this research was approved by ethical review committee (this information is absolutely necessary). The authors should still mention if the written consent was obtained from participants.	Revised accordingly. Please see yellow highlighted text. We also got similar comments from another reviewer.
	Line 72: The authors should provide more information about EMIC stigma scale, where this scale was constructed and validated, original language and as well its psychometric properties. It would be interesting to introduce a reference of its publication.	Information about EMIC stigma scale is now included in the revised manuscript. Please see text with turquoise highlight.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 79 - I have doubts about analysis of the qualitative data, how were these data analyzed? Authors mentioned about content analysis, however the authors should add more information about the procedures considered to the data analysis, e.g. transcription of speech, reading in-depth of the interviews, extraction of key categories, among others. Did the authors use some software to do that? It is important to highlight those aspects.	Revised accordingly. Please see text with turquoise highlight.
	Results: The results were satisfactory presented, except on the table 1 (the table is not formatted adequately, so the authors need to review it). The legends of the graphs 1 and 2 also were unclear.	Revised accordingly.
	Discussion: Authors should mention the limitations of study as well what they considered to control them....	The limitations are included in the revised manuscript. Please see text with turquoise highlight.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The authors should mention if this study was approved by the ethical committee and also if	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		