



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_14726
Title of the Manuscript:	Primary pyomyositis: Its socioeconomic effects; Community overview
Type of the 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Their study was conducted among patients, next of kin, health workers and opinion leaders to assess the community's views on the socioeconomic effects of pyomyositis to the patients, family, health facilities and community. This manuscript had various drawbacks. First, the author should clarify the entire the content of interviews. Second, the author should arrange the data to show respondents' answer to questions. It is not necessary to write the conversation. Third, there were a lot of bibliographic consideration and less analysis result.	Thank you for your fair comments! I have the following responses to the issues raised: 1. This paper is a qualitative paper which used three methods of data collection and triangulated it to obtain the information presented (Thematic data analysis was used). 2. The data obtained was analysed by an approach known as thematic analysis and therefore does not require us to show individual responses unless really required and this would have been too long to be presented in this manuscript. 3. This has been corrected in the revised manuscript. It shows more of the findings and the discussions from what was observed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		