



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: By now, I should have had little or nothing to correct since this is the third time I am reviewing this manuscript. 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.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Elvis Shu
Department, University & Country	Department of Pharmacology & Therapeutics, College of Medicine, University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus, Enugu State, Nigeria