



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_16368
Title of the Manuscript:	AN EIGHT-YEAR REVIEW OF MORBIDITY AND MORTALITY AMONG ADULT PATIENTS WITH TETANUS AT A TERTIARY HOSPITAL IN ZARIA, NORTHERN NIGERIA
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors retrieved the case notes of all adult (≥ 15 years) tetanus patients. Why not all the patients at all ages? However, in the "RESULTS" section, it is written "with a range of 10-65 years". Could the author please clarify this? The statistics in this manuscript were reported as mean$\pm$standard deviation. It would be better to shown the individual data points in tables and plots to reveal the data distribution. Please add tables and some plots such as strip-chart (one-dimensional scatter plot). From the manuscript, it seems that the data distribution is not normal. The better way to present the data is probably to report the median. For example, the IP time is from 3-30 days but 55% of patients (26) had IP less than 7 days. Therefore, reporting the IP with a mean 14.2$\pm$10.5 days is misleading. The same problem occurred in reporting the onset time (6-72 hours) with a mean of 31.1$\pm$23.5 hours while 70% of patients have onset time less than 24 hours. All these data should be reported as median and percentile instead of the misleading means. Is the difference of IP in patients regarding to the survival statistically significant? Again, is the difference of onset time between the survived and diseased patients statistically significant? Again, please assign the statistical significance on the	The cases reviewed were mainly those managed by the adult neurology unit, and so younger patients were excluded. The age range recorded was an error. The comment on measure of central tendency noted. The corrections have been duly made. The differences in both IP and OT are significant, and they have been reflected in the write-up. Same as in the severity of disease.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	severity of the disease regarding to the survival although there is apparent significant difference in the data. In the section of "Outcome of tetanus", there are p values for predicting mortality based on IP, onset and severity and complications. How is this prediction performed? What statistical model is used? Please clarify this in that section and the method section.	The clarifications have been done.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the pie chart under the line 108, the percentage of severe group (35%) is inconsistent with that reported in the text (34%) and this is not due to the rounding error. Please correct it. Also, for the percentage in the pie chart, please keep one digit after the decimal point to avoid the confusion.	Thanks, that has been corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author performed great study on the patients of Tetanus infection in that area. There are some minor statistical problems to be fixed before the publication.	Noted.