



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_13295
Title of the Manuscript:	Addressing stigma related to leprosy: lessons from an intervention study in Thailand
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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In material and method section: Statistical formulae and grouping must be defined more clearly.	No formulae were used. We calculated sample sizes using OpenEpi.com. We analysed the quantitative data using SPSS for Windows, vs17
	In discussion section: Interpretation of all three groups must be explained on the basis of statistical data calculation.	This paper focuses on how the interventions were launched and their qualitative results. The pre-intervention statistical data was presented to justify our attempt to launch de-stigmatising interventions. This pre-data will be compared with post-intervention statistical data. It will be presented in another paper that we would like to ask the editor to publish it simultaneously with this paper.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is written and presented well. However, I would like to suggest a minor improvement, that the author can draw flow chart or diagram to show various group and their major activities and proposals. So one can under more efficiently the conclusion driven by this study.	Revised accordingly. We put the texts in Table 1.