



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_12016
Title of the Manuscript:	Blister and Bulla following Snake Bite in Nigeria: a prospective cohort study
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- We recommend for the authors to investigate an eventual association between age ranges and the onset of blister and bulla or Poor-outcome. And to discuss also the impact of the family of snake (cobra or viper) on the outcome of the bite - It is important to include in the results analysis the time elapsed between snake bite and time of hospital admission.	Association between age ranges and onset of blister/bulla has been added. The total number of cobra and night adder bite were so few to allow for comparison of all the defined outcomes however we have added impact of the family of snake on mortality. Noted and has been added
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Corrections the Results section: - Page 3 (line 17): substitute 1/85 by 1/86 - Page 4 (line 7): substitute 25.6% by 25.8%	Corrected Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- The snakebite patients enrolled in this study was 128, but in the result section, we found only 100 patients distributed according to the age group. You should check this error (3rd and 4th lines in the results section).	100 patients were reported because we intentionally did not included 31-40, 41-50 and 51-60 age groups, on assumption that we have highlighted the age groups with highest and lowest numbers of cases affected. But we have now included these age groups, this makes the total number of patients to 128.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- The article is of interest and well written. - The main objective is clear and well discussed.	