



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Introduction. The author refer's to the Abuja Declaration of 2005 with reference to ITN indicators but does not attempt to update this information with the revised indicators by the Global Malaria Action Plan or the UN Call for Universal Coverage where Universal Coverage is called for. Targeting of vulnerable groups was advocated for by Abuja but WHO ,GMAP and the UN changed this strategy to Universal coverage. This analysis is not discussed at all. Whereas the title states household possession in the results, there is no explanation as to the difference between possession and use. The strategy of vector control using ITNs is not expounded is it 50% coverage for the vulnerable groups only in the whole population. There is an attempt to distinguish Mass campaigns and keep-up strategies but it is muddled. The results should use proportions and not absolute numbers. The Malaria control strategies as a whole should be expounded so that the reader understands that ITNs is just one of the strategies for controlling malaria (apart from case management, prompt diagnosis, IPTp etc..specific for Uganda). There is a plethora of papers on ITN possession and use in the literature but the discussion is very weak. It could be because the study design is of poor quality. There is also no reference to the fact that LLINs are not the same as ITNs, although they have	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the same purpose. The paper states mosquito bites while ITNs are protective against mosquito vector species as our target is vectors against malaria – <i>Anopheles gambiae</i>. One gets the impression that one sleeps under a net to avoid bites of any mosquito. A lot more could be done on the arguments of having a different strategy for IDPs especially if the writer could expound what is the coverage in the normal population. Then they could elaborate the best approach for IDPs and why.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	None	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper has to be re-written taking into consideration the above comments. As it is it is not worth publishing	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer