



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_6496
Title of the Manuscript:	Insecticide Treated Bednet Possession among Pregnant Women in Gulu: a post conflict district in Northern Uganda
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	Title: It should reflect the work done. There is more to the possession of ITNs (See Results Sction). Methods: It should be in subheadings with detailed description. Subheadings such as study area, sampling and sample size including inclusion/exclusion criteria, data collection, data management and analysis. Results: --The use of numerical values instead of percentages is inappropriate and should be corrected throughout this Results Section. Eg The second sentence of the results should read "Majority of the pregnant women (70%) had primary education". --The start of sentence with a figure is not proper. --Only salient points on each Table need to be stated, not listing all the results on the Table. --Information about each Table should come at the beginning of the paragraph. Eg The last sentence of paragraph 1 should be moved to the beginning of the paragraph to allow the reader follow up the results. This should be done for all the Tables. --I do not see the difference between Tables 4 and 5. Discussion: -- There is a very serious syntax problem with this manuscript, particularly with the Discussion Section. --The sentences are usually too long, making it difficult to follow up the discussion.	Revision has been made to the title. Correction made taking into consideration the concern raised. Revised as suggested Table 4 is a bivariate results which look at the effect of each socio-demographic characteristics of respondents on ITN possession at a time while table 5 is amultivariate results which look at the effect of socio-demographic characteristics respondents on ITN possession at the same time.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	--Throughout the manuscript (particularly the Discussion Section), the authors are mixing up tenses.	Discussion was rewritten and proof read by other authors.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	ABSTRACT: --Scanty results --Who are the study participants? --No data collection tool was mentioned --This section has incongruous and hard-to-understand phrases: eg No Business, Have attended antenatal services, etc	Abstract revised taking into consideration of the suggestions.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	--Because of the very serious syntax problems and other comments, one of the authors should re-write the manuscript and pass it to the other authors. If single author, his/her colleagues should help. --	