



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_7437
Title of the Manuscript:	The Epidemiology of Trachoma in the Lower Shire valley of Southern Malawi
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	1. The paper is relatively poorly written overall. The Authors should have checked the the paper more carefully. Please also check the tenses and the spacing between words. Missing of spaces between words makes it very difficult to read. 2. Please remember disease names and drug names are all small letters except commercial names or at the beginning of the sentence. Please revise throughout the paper. 3. At the end of the Introduction, there needs to be a clear description of the purpose of the paper. 4. Methods: the sections before "Sample size" look messy. Please use subheadings to separate "Ethical clearance" and "Study areas." I am not sure of the purpose of Lines 80-88. 5. Training: please describe a bit more details on how exactly the training and certifying of the graders were carried out. 6. More details are needed on statistical analysis. 7. Whole results section needs to be reorganized and better presented. Consider using subheadings to help. 8. Table 3 is incomplete and not clearly readable. Be consistent with the terms used in the text. 9. Table 4 does not make sense. 10. More details on the analysis results of risk factors are needed. Current description is very unclear. What are the results of the statistical analysis on prevalence?	The paper has been written. Tables and spacing were to do with conversion to PDF. This has been corrected. Corrected Done see page 6 line 128 Done see 158 Done line 189 Done-see table 4 page 13 See new tables 1-4 redone Analysis of risk factors done. See table 4 page 13 line 308
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Lines 60-61, "and knowing". I am not convinced by this. The statement is not among the purpose of the survey or the paper. Trachoma is quite focal and it may not reflect anything going on in Mozambique. 2. Line 95, "...was been chosen...", remove "been". 3. Line 119, what are KK and IS? Line 125, what is LS? You do not need	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	to mention people's names or initials here. Sight Savers Epidemiologist should be Sightsavers epidemiologist. 4. Line 129, "will collect" should be "collected" or change it to the format for b) and c). 5. Line 139, "organize" to "organized". 6. Line 141, "have been" to "had been". 7. Line 182, table number is not correct. 8.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The topic is important but the quality of the writing needs improving before it can be considered for publication.	