



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
TITLE: There is still a problem with this title. The factors referred to here (no formal educ, no antenatal visit etc etc) are those related to possession of nets but the attitudes and perceptions are still left out (see attached manuscript). "Possession, attitude, and perceptions of insecticide-treated bednets among pregnant women in a post conflict district in Northern Uganda" should have been adopted. ABSTRACT: See comments on the manuscript particularly the results. The results are centred on the possession of nets and factors relating to it, leaving out attitudes and perceptions. The information on the additional results and Tables (5 and 6) is not captured. METHODS: Full of syntax problems (see manuscript for some) RESULTS: Apart from the several comments on the results, Table 4 displays an issue worth questioning and it was a new addition to the previous results. Why were these household monthly incomes not stated in the text under the Results Section? What story do these incomes tell considering that most of the nets in the communities were provided by health centres (233) and NGOs (41) and only 41 respondents purchased the nets? It would have been more meaningful to know how many respondents in each socio-economic status (SES) (quartile as you call it) had free nets, and how many from each SES purchased the nets. You may even find out that only the rich women purchased the nets and poor ones went for the free nets. See the Results Section and Tables for more comments. DISCUSSION: We can not complete the Discussion because of the grammatical/syntax problems. GENERAL COMMENT: Additional good results were introduced but not well managed. The results also lacked a normal flow. Most of all, the grammar needs some special attention.	The title has been revised as suggested. Results of table for the Bivariate results for Attitude and Perception associated with ITN were not included in the abstract because those variables which were significant and any other with a P-value of 0.2 were taken to the logistic model to assess for interaction and confounding. The results reported in the abstract are the multivariate results for the predictor of ITN possession. It contains results on attitude and perception like Willingness to buy ITN and Willingness to recommend ITN use to others. However, we have include also univariate results for attitude and perception as highlighted in the abstract. Methods syntax problems have been corrected. High compliance means using ITN regularly in a week i.e. 5 times and above in one week. The household monthly incomes were not stated in the text in the results' section because not every piece of information in the table is to be written in the results' section. The results' section should capture the most important information contained in the table. That is why we stated that table.....summarises the results on..... What story does income tell? We asked each of the respondents whether she was willing to buy ITN if the net was to be sold to them. Because of this, it was necessary to gauge their household income to see whether they could be in a position to purchase the net. For those who were not willing to purchase the net, we asked them to gives reasons why they were not willing to buy the net. The most cited reason was lack of money. If you can see from Table 1, majority of the respondents household incomes in a month ranges from zero to Shillings5,000. If free distribution of net was stopped, majority of the respondents would not be in position to acquire ITN for personal protection against malaria and that is the story the income is telling. Sources of ITN: One respondent was unable to tell the source of ITN she was using because she has eloped with the husband. Variables I have not gone for antenatal visit and Not given from health centres are not same. The first one the respondent never went for ANC while the latter went and was not given an ITN. Discussion: 42% of the respondents were possessing ITN and not 72% as indicated in the comment. Majority who did not possessed ITN indicated that they were not given ITN despite going for antenatal services. We believe this could be due to ITN stock out from the health facility.