

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_114982
Title of the Manuscript:	FAMILY FACTORS INFLUENCING INTENTIONAL SELF-ORGANOPHOSPHATE POISONING AMONG PERSONS OF AGE 15-30 YEARS IN KERICHO COUNTY, KENYA.
Type of the Article	

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The topic is interesting because it sheds light on an important issue of the quality of life of young people in a developing country.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is.</p> <p>3. The abstract will have to be rewritten after changes to the text. In addition to the content, it is important to pay attention to the structure.</p> <p>4. The structure presented is similar to a thesis report. I prefer a more objective text for the article.</p> <p>5. To be scientifically correct, the author should point out more clearly that this is an exploratory study that seeks a correlation between variables, and does not allow the evaluation of cause and effect.</p> <p>6. Yes.</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>	<p>Youth suicide is an important topic for local development, and correlating it with family factors is important to generate more effective counseling recommendations. However, the article should make it clear to the reader why the choice was made to delimit the cases of organophosphate poisoning. How much does this choice for self-extinction represent, in relation to all the methods chosen in this age group? Despite the interesting correlation with family factors, there are many confounding factors that should be addressed and discussed.</p> <p>The author should: Observe greater objectivity in the text, without so many repetitions; Standardize the form of citation according to the citation style used by the journal; Describe what the acronyms used throughout the text mean. Consider that aesthetics in the layout of the text and figures must be observed</p> <p>In the Methods section, clarify the study as exploratory and correlational.</p> <p>In the Results section, the sociodemographic characterization of the sample should be presented. The other results should be presented in tables or graphs based on the analysis. A simple copy of the presentation of results provided by SPSS is not appropriate.. As for the qualitative data collected, include them in the Results or remove them from the Method.</p> <p>The Discussion deserves to be expanded, with a greater analysis of the results and a clear approach to the limitations of the study.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Raquel Rangel Cesario
Department, University & Country	Academia Magdala Sustenta SSAO, Brazil