



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMMR_6435
Title of the Manuscript:	FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE COMPLIANCE WITH ANNUAL IVERMECTIN TREATMENT AND WILLINGNESS OF INDIVIDUALS TO CONTINUE WITH THE TREATMENT IN ABIA STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Full-length

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lines 99-112: Authors must specify the kinds of questionnaires administered (e.g. open-ended, etc.) This would have a bearing on the number of factors recorded as influencing compliance... - Lines 99-100: Who filled and returned these questionnaires and forms to guarantee that they "were properly filled", considering that several African populations record high levels of illiteracy? - Line 127: Do authors mean table 1 or figure 1? - Line 128: Authors mention "have heard/ seen benefits" (93.2%)..." But table 1 shows "have heard/ seen benefits" (94.2%). This must be clarified! Which figure is which??? - Table 1: Why are their N 487 and 71 respectively factors influencing compliance and factors detrimental to compliance respectively, instead of 558, the size of the sample people interviewed ??? - Table 1: factors influencing compliance or detrimental must be arranged to reflect some order, preferably in a decreasing manner (from most important to least important). - Lines 138 to 143: Table 2 is not referred to in the text. If it fell off, no one would be looking for it as missing! - Lines 159 to 162 are repetitions that add nothing to the manuscript, and are wrongly located in the paper. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Lines 185-196: authors recognise health education as pivotal to improve compliance and recommend that "...existing health education material should be reviewed..." They must briefly describe the existing health education material for onchocerciasis control in the APOC or Nigeria or Abia state, and say what aspect are unfit/obsolete and suggest approaches to review it, or aspects of it that need improvement!- Line 2009: APOC (2009) is not cited in the text! Clarify if the reference is APOC (2009) or APOC/WHO (2009) on line 65.- Lines 199-265: Some references cited need edition to maintain consistency in the style.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Line 7: read “Individuals’ adhesion to annual...”- Abstract must be rewritten to be simpler to read and understand; e.g. line 11: “...of Abia State that are documented as hyperendemic...” (this was previously established, and not in this study); e.g. 2 line 12 and 14: “A questionnaire was administered to 558 people to determine factors that positively influence compliance to annual ivermectin treatment. Of these 526 (94.2%)...”; etc.- Lines 87, read “... the programme had spread to other...”- Line 88: I believe the programme had been over 17 years in 2011, time of the survey!- Line 99: at the beginning of a sentence, write “558” in letters.- Lines 126-127: “...(figure 1), responses in order of priority...”- Lines 126 to 132: Absolute values should accompany percentages to improve readability of data.- Lines 116-118: the authors justify the use of bar chart as allowing for quick appreciation... If so, figure 1 will be improved by rearranging the data so that bars appear in decreasing order of importance as revealed by questionnaires to actually allow for quick appreciation of the suggested ways of improvement.- Line 164: While Mectizan is presumably known to all readers to be the brand name for ivermectin, the manuscript would gain in clarity if it were reminded the first time it appears in the text.- Line 169: read “... get involved d and participate...”	
---------------------------------------	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper is competent in outlining some of the aspects that must be reviewed in order to guarantee the success of the challenging endeavour that chemotherapeutic fight against onchocerciasis, a greatly debilitating disease represents.</p> <p>The authors need to be educated on the difference between an administrative authorisation to conduct research and an ethical clearance to conduct work involving humans as target or as source of information!</p>	
---	---	--

Note: Anonymous Reviewer