



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>The following are my major comments:</p> <p>1. Sample size: How was the sample size determined? This was not stated in the materials and methods. 558 people were interviewed on factors that positively influence compliance, however table 1 shows two cohorts. It is not clear how the 2 sample sizes n=487 and n=71 on table 1 were determined. It is therefore not clear whether one or 2 questionnaires were administered.</p> <p>2. In both the Materials and methods and the results sections, the demographic data of the volunteers, ie. age, gender, etc were not stated. But these are very vital information that would improve on the manuscript.</p> <p>3. There was no compliance data in the study area to justify the need for study in that area.</p> <p>Result section</p> <p>1. On Line 127, it should be table 1 and not figure 1 as stated in the manuscript.</p> <p>2. From line 128-132, the figures / percentages quoted there for "have heard/seen "(93.2%), "To be healthy" (28.2%) were different from the figures in the table 1. Hence the results are flawed.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>3. In table 2, they need to state the P-value.</p> <p>4. In fig 1, in the y-axis, what is the meaning of mean(%)? mean (%) of what?</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<p>1. Ivermectin is spelt sometimes in the manuscript with capital "I" as Ivermectin and others with small "i". They should be consistent.</p> <p>2. In the introduction, on line 47, it should read "...and maintain a minimum of 65% and not "maximum" as stated there.</p> <p>3. On line 60 in the introduction, it reads ...APOC as the original 25 projects... what is the meaning of the 25 projects. The statement is not clear.</p> <p>On line 72, it should be ivermectin and not ivermectic</p> <p>4. In discussion the CDDs attrition was not linked to any of the questions in the questionnaire. A proper link could have been created.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer