



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_16822
Title of the Manuscript:	Demographic and hearing related variables important for prediction of disabling hearing impairment: A community based survey
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	There are lots of sites to insert null character, e.g. L113, 115, 119, 120, 121, 123, 128, 129, 146, 204, 218, 227, 230, 237, and 300 and Table 1, 2. Explanation of abbreviation (DHL) was doubled in L46 and 52. Table 2 is not informative and the contents should be mentioned in the text. Table 3 Frequency may be number? Table 4 There are not explanation for abbreviation (df, Sig). Are there any concrete data of causable ear diseases, e.g. OME, SNHL?	I thank you so much for your comments: we must confess that we are not familiar with the usage of this null character and how to insert it. DHL in line 52 deleted Table 2 expunged and replaced with demographic profile as also suggested by another reviewer. Frequency changed to number Line 226 shows the explanations. Yes there is, however this was not included since the profile of ear diseases seen was not the objective of this study. But we will be happy to include it if it will give the study more value, at your instance.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The quite high rate of DHL is skeptical. I think that it is because of noisy condition at the time of audiometry or concentration of young subjects. The threshold of DHL is the key of this study without soundproof booth. Hearing level threshold difference between with and without soundproof booth should be discussed.	The high rate as discussed, in our opinion, was due to the small sample size and the fact that this survey was carried out after news of this survey was announced via the media, meaning a huge cohort of ear/hearing complain population is expected. However, the issue regarding with/without sound treated booth is valid as it is claimed that test-retest reliability is better with soundproof booths. We have attempted to discuss this briefly citing a study which shows they can be comparable. See line 281-293