



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_16547
Title of the Manuscript:	Health Education program on Leptospirosis among college students in Chennai, South India
Type of the Article	Short 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	In my opinion the design of the study should be interventional study (community setting) not cross sectional study. Authors are also recommended to explain in detail target/study population, sampling population, how did they have their respondents (sampling methods), sampling frame and sample size calculation. Contents and approaches of health education in this study should also be explained in detail; how it was formulated and platforms used to reach the target population. Mc Nemar test is the appropriate name, not McNemer's chi square test.	The design of the study has been corrected to interventional study. Choice of the population study- There are no published data on awareness programs in the country on leptospirosis among students. Therefore increasing the awareness of leptospirosis among college students will decrease its incidence. There are more than 90 arts and science colleges in Chennai. Health education programs are often conducted in these colleges through National Service Scheme. That is why this group of students were chosen. (These have been incorporated into the manuscript) This is a qualitative study and the results of the study were analysed using non parametric tests A 20 minute visual health education session was administered with the help of powerpoint presentation on Leptospirosis This has been corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		(All the above points have been incorporated into the revised manuscript and highlighted in yellow).
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Contingency table is preferred compared to graph presented in Figure 1; the significance p should also be highlighted.	As there are 4 parameters in the graph, contingency table might appear very confusing for the readers. The outcome of the analysis is explicitly understandable in the graph. P value is included in the graph.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In general, the article has valuable content but its method need to be improved so that the conclusion is valid.	