



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_13296
Title of the Manuscript:	The effectiveness of de-stigmatizing interventions
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	Thank you for letting me conducts a review of this manuscript. This manuscript shows interesting findings, which are valuable in this area. However, I have some comments that I think the authors should take into consideration. However, I have some comments that I think the authors should take into consideration.	Thank you very much for such valuable comments. We appreciated this very much.
	There are two other articles, i.e. <i>unpublished data</i> and 17, which report results from this project. I lack a description of that this manuscript is a part of a larger project. There is a need for some text that shows that the authors do not "salami slicing" this project.	We inserted some text in the last paragraph of the introduction.
	In the "Data collection methods" I think it should be written <i>Explanatory Model Interview Catalogue (EMIC) stigma scale</i>.	Explanatory Model Interview Catalogue (EMIC) stigma scale now appear in the first paragraph of "data collection methods"
	I lack a description of place and duration of this study in "material and methods". Now, I only can read this information in the abstract.	Duration and place of study now appear in the first paragraph of the heading 'Material and Methods'
	In the results, I think the authors should present the 177 community members of each sample. Now it is written <i>177 community members, 136 (76, 8%) were female, 104 (58,8 %) completed primary school...</i> These numbers are difficult to understand, because the latter numbers are from two samples.	The Samples are now presented in two heading before and after interventions.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	I would like more information about the 177 health workers, such as age and education.	Unfortunately, we did not collect age and education of health workers. We present this as the limitation of the study.
	In the discussion, I lack a description of the limitations of this study and recommendations for further research.	The limitation is now included
	Except the authors own publication, 17, no reference is newer than 2008. Has no research been published in this area during the latter five years?	The studies of Rodchan S in 2011 and Kaehler 2013 are now referred
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		