



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 | |

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 <i>(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)</i> |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>Generally this is an important article which is relevant to policy makers in developing countries however,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Typographical and grammatical errors needs to be corrected. 2. The abstract needs to be re-written to follow the guidelines of the publishers and relevant information included under the major subtitles 3. The introduction should review data on prevalence of Ivermectin use in Africa and Nigeria where the study was carried out and compare such statistics to the rest of the world. Literature in Africa should be profusely cited 4. Methodology of the study was not written at all. When was the study done?, 5. What study design was employed, 6. What were the xteristics of study participants????etc. 7. Study area was not described. 8. Sample size was not calculated. Data collection technique was not specified 9. There was no ethical consideration. Were consents taken? 10. Any ethical approval 11. Data analysis technique was not properly written. 12. Chi square should be specified with the p- | |



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>values</p> <p>13. Data was not well presented. Xteristics of the participants was not shown.</p> <p>14. Can dermographic xteristics influence compliance??Pls add this information to make your research meaningful</p> <p>15. How did you measure compliance?? Pls specify in methodology</p> <p>16. Your discussion look like the repetition of the result. Pick the facts one by one and compare with other studies.</p> <p>17. Conclusion should be derived from yours study.</p> <p>18. Pls overall and update your refrences</p> <p>19.</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | Consider subjecting your data to multivariate analysis | |
| Optional/General comments | The article should be re written and resubmitted taking above comments into consideration | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | O.E. Amoran |
| Department, University & Country | Dept of Community Medicine, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Sagamu, Nigeria |