



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_13024
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge, attitude and practice towards neonatal jaundice among community health workers in Southern Nigeria
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 The authors assess the knowledge of community health workers on neonatal jaundice in Southern Nigeria. They found that community health workers may recognize neonatal jaundice but knowledge on causes and treatment is inadequate. This is a descriptive study. The statistical analysis and results of the relationship between work experience and treatment knowledge were not clearly described.	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	1. Abstract, Results: "Work experience was significantly associated with knowledge of the use of EBT and phototherapy in the treatment of NNJ with those less than 5 years having better knowledge than the older ones" is not precise. Please describe the detailed data of knowledge and work experience (years) in Results section. 2. Conclusion: "Knowledge seems to worsen with longer duration of service". Please give P values of this relationship (seems) and discuss the causes in Discussion.	Table IV has been modified to include years of service. Conclusion has been modified and possible causes highlighted in the discussion.
Minor REVISION comments	1. This study was explained to participants and only those who gave consent were given the questionnaires to fill. Please indicate the study was approved by an Institutional Review Board. 2. Line 80: Does the value (6.01 ± 4.97 years) represent mean ± SD? 3. Line 124: Change "earlier mentioned1" to "earlier mentioned [1]". 4. Table V is not clearly described. Is the upper row or the lower row with complication? The percentages of other blindness and death were not correct. Change 1 (1.5) to 1 (0.5), 23 (115) to 23 (11.5), and 200 00) to 200 (100).	The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Bayelsa State College of Health Technology. This has been included in the text 6.01 ± 4.97 years represents mean ± SD Line 124 has been corrected 'earlier mentioned [1]' has been corrected Table V has been corrected
Optional/General comments	Need to indicate this study was approved by the Institutional Review Board.	