



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	Authors evaluated the perception of community members and health workers regarding leprosy stigma in the community, to study possible determinants of Stigma, and to provide baseline data for those interested in launching de-stigmatizing interventions. Thus, the article was well elaborated and discussed, and the study appear to be very interesting and of great interest in the clinical area; and I suggest minor revision to improve the work	Thank you very much for such encouraging comments. <b>We appreciated this very much.</b>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	Authors should review small errors of concordance and typing. I only have minor suggestions to improve the work: - - The results are very large it could be reduced.	We omitted some less relevant statements in the revised manuscript.
	- Legends and figures are very confused and low resolution.	Revised accordingly.
	- No need that the authors describe the abbreviations contained in the tables and figures; it can be put in the legends.	We could not find the lines in which we described the abbreviations. Our apologies.
	- I also suggest that the authors discuss their results simultaneously for thus facilitates the understanding of the data and conclusions of the article.	We would like to separate the results and the discussion to show clearly to readers what were actual findings and statements of our respondents and what were our own interpretations of these.
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		