



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_18726
Title of the Manuscript:	Enteric Viruses Association With Diarrhea in Young Children 0-24 Months in an Urban Secondary Health Center in Benin City, 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 I feel this is a weak MS that requires a more careful presentation of data.	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	What was the definition for diarrhea? What inclusion criteria were used? Was diarrhea evaluated as light, moderate or severe? Was it acute or chronic diarrhea? A new episode? How many days without diarrhea to consider it a new episode? Any clinical evaluations at time of study? Any criteria used to clinical evaluation of children? Sunken eyes? Loss of skin turgor? What were the criteria for control inclusion? Were controls matched for age and sex? Was their stool collected during same times of study? Were controls of same place of residence? Were the stools maintained cool until examination? Did they conduct an interview to parents or guardians to collect demographic, clinical or epidemiologic information? What were the age strata for exclusive breastfeeding? Mixed feeding? Solid foods? Were stools examined macroscopically? Was blood observed in stools? What was the sensitivity and specificity of tests used according to manufacturer? Any discrepancy found? How were the sensibility and specificity according to authors? Were they satisfied with test performance? Results require better description. Tables could be combined and consolidated into fewer ones. Any comparison of diarrhea with type of virus identified? Any analysis of severity of diarrhea with virus found? Viruses are known to be transmitted more from person to person contact that through soil or water contamination (lines 94-96). Lines 84-85 and 93 to	Diarrhea was defined as the passage of watery or loose stool 3 times or more within a 24 hour period. The inclusion criteria were children from birth to 24 months with clinical symptoms of diarrhea. The type of diarrhea was acute. The controls were apparently healthy age-matched children without diarrhea made up of male and female living in the same locality. The stool samples were collected and processed at the time of study. Both patients and controls were within the same locality. The samples were collected and maintained cool before processing. Demographic information was obtained through consented parents or guardians of the children. The age stratum for exclusive breastfeeding was from birth to 6 months of age. There was no defined age for mixed feeding and solid food because every mother practices different methods of feeding. The kits used for this study were sensitive and specific. They were satisfied with test performance. The results have been described better and tables 1 and 3 have been merged together. Other issues raised here have been taken care of by the authors.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	99 in Discussion should be placed in Results. Since there are other agents that can cause diarrhea in children of different age strata, and because this study did not try to identify other agents, probably viruses were not the only agent that could have been present in the population studied. This and other similar comments or evidence presentation should be part of the Discussion. No references from similar studies in the last seven years cited in this MS.	The first part of of the discussion has been placed in the results. Other issues raised have been taken care of by the authors.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Any funding source? Better description of ethics committee revision of protocol. What limitations were identified in this study? Revise key words. Revise Reference writing. References Nos. 6, 8, 12, 22?	This research work was not funded by any organization. It was privately done by the authors. Other issues have been taken care of by the authors.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		