



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>Problem in the study design: One would like to know the compliance profile of the study participants -How many years were they offered to take Ivermectin? -How many time (years) did they take it? -Were they all high compliers or low compliers? Ideally, the study design supposed to have a group of participants who are high compliers to the treatment and another group of participants who are low compliers to the treatment, such that responses to questions could be compared between the two groups</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The paper addresses an important and current health problem, which is compliance to long term ivermectin treatment and mechanisms to improve compliance. Nonetheless, the paper fails to address some key issues as identified beneath: The paper does not provide the methodology section which could help to elucidate some of the worries on the nature of the study area, the study participants and the study design. These elements are instrumental in understanding a few issues on the study participants and the study communities thereby leading to an understanding of the factors that may influence compliance. The study further fails to define key concepts</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>which are; Low compliers and High compliers. An operationalisation of these concepts will help to understand the category of respondents referred to as low compliers and high compliers.</p> <p>Moreover, the paper seems to focus on quantitative data but if the study were a triangulation with the focuses on qualitative methods with supporting evidence from quantitative data, the results will be more explicit and the opinion of community members will be elucidated with the verbatim from the in-depth interviews.</p> <p>Failure to identify study participants leaves the data hanging because we do not know where the data is coming from and which category of respondent is saying what. Therefore more has to be done to make the paper complete.</p> <p>From the above observations, we think the paper has raised a very important problem but has not been able to provide adequate evidence to solve it due to the deficiencies highlighted hitherto.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer