



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_12143
Title of the Manuscript:	Ownership of Bed nets and use for children below 5 years in Sagamu Local Government Area of Ogun State, Nigeria
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	• Abstract should be well written. The way it is written is simply showing the highlights • At the end of the introduction section, the objective of the study has to be clearly specified • The methodology part has to be written properly ○ The methodology must include the method used for the analysis ○ Survey areas ○ The sampling procedure used to select the respondents • The chi-square test was used in the analysis. This method only gives the association between two variables. I suggest the authors to use statistical model technique to see the relationship between predictor variables such as age, education, occupation, etc, and the ownership of bed nets Result section • Result section only shows the highlights of the findings. But, the result section should be written properly. Please re-write this section • The authors mentioned about multivariate regression. But, where is the result and interpretation? • Page 5 second paragraph, the authors wrote about proportion. From where does this	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	proportion comes from? Please explain how you obtained the proportion	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	General comment • The paper is badly organized • All sections including the abstract has to be re-written properly • The formatting of tables has to be uniform. Please reformat the table • The result section is badly written. It is difficult to follow the findings. There are results with no explanation how the results obtained • Reference section has to be re-written properly • After re-writing the paper again, it can be sent for review. In its current shape, I don't think the paper is appropriate for publication. • In general, the finding of this study has no new findings. The contribution of the study to the literature is very minimal	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer