

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_99589
Title of the Manuscript:	KNOWLEDGE AND MANAGEMENT OF BURULI ULCER DISEASE: A CASE STUDY AT SEKYERE AFRAM PLAINS DISTRICT OF ASHANTI REGION, GHANA
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:

(<https://www.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Less important 2. No. It needs revision 3. No. It needs revision 4. No. It needs revision 5. No. Some items in the questionnaire were miscategorized (perception, knowledge, opinion, etc) 6. References was sufficient and recent. But all references were written incorrect. The author did not follow the guideline. Many citations were not shown in the references <p>Title Please revise. Several tables in the manuscript indicate that the management was likely incorrect (Table 6). It ought to be an attitude towards BU management. The table 7 seemed irrelevant to the subject of this manuscript.</p> <p>Abstract Please revise. This is not the purpose of the study. The conclusion was not in line with the purpose and title.</p> <p>Introduction Please revise. Simplify the introduction (4 pages). Turnitin revealed that nearly all of the sentences in the introduction were duplicated from other publications..</p> <p>Method Please revise. Simplify the method section.</p> <p>Line 126-143 Please delete. According to my argument, the geographic location, religion, and even latitude and longitude were irrelevant to this Buruli ulcer.</p> <p>Line 134, 138, 160 Please revise. Where did the reference? Line 146-147 Please delete. No correlation to the relevance of manuscript topic. Table 1 and 2 Please revise. Add abbreviation Line 181 Please revise. How many questions did the survey contain? What sort of scale was utilised in the survey? Open-ended or closed questions? What is the grade for each answer? Prior to the investigation, no validation or reliability test was conducted on the questionnaire.</p> <p>Table 4 Please revise. How did the author manage to show X2 score and p-value without any data from baseline?</p> <p>Table 5 Please revise. Why did the author only present the percent score for sex group, not all groups?</p> <p>Table 6 Please consider deleting. My opinion that an active member or not, should not be categorized in the management of BU. Please consider deleting. My opinion that an "awareness", should not be categorized in the</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>management of BU. Please consider deleting. My opinion that “a health facility”, should not be categorized in the management of BU. Please consider deleting. My opinion that “money to support transportation”, should not be categorized in the management of BU. Please consider deleting. My opinion that “an enablers package”, should not be categorized in the management of BU. Please consider deleting. My opinion that “health worker attitude”, should not be categorized in the management of BU.</p> <p>Discussion Please revise. Many findings from the results section were not addressed in the discussion section. Some elements were miscategorized (perception, attitude, opinion, knowledge). Line 301, 303, 306, 316, 319 Please revise. Where did the reference?</p> <p>References MUST revise. Follow template guideline for references.</p> <p>#1 how did the reference from 2007, but the year is 2017? #3 original paper? #6 unclear #7 unclear #17 different year #19 different year #21 unclear #23 unclear #26 unclear #29 unclear #37 unclear author #51 unclear</p> <p>MUST revise. There were many citations in the manuscript without references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No it needs revision</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Indrayadi Gunardi</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Universitas Trisakti, Indonesia</p>