

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_115030
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF PERSONAL SPECIFIC LIFE-EVENTS ON ORGANOPHOSPHATE INTENTIONAL SELF-POISONING AMONG PERSONS AGED 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>YES – it explores the determinants of self-harm behaviours and could have potential role in preventing suicides in the community.</p> <p>Needs revision – recommendation: “Study of person-specific life events influencing intentional self-harm in young population in Kericho, Kenya” The other variables such as organophosphorus poisoning and age of sample population need not be mentioned in the title.</p> <p>NO – needs to be more organised into subsections of background, methods, results and conclusions. Formatting could be improved in terms of grammar and syntax.</p> <p>Ample revisions suggested:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete document would benefit from grammatical and syntactical editing. 2. Some of the data appears to be overlapping directly with pre-existing literature – kindly run an independent plagiarism check. 3. No need to include limitations right in the beginning of the study. Instead, describe them as challenges faced during the study, and means resorted to address them. 4. Methodology: It would be useful to define some terms used such as ‘not mentally stable’ or ‘drug use’ especially given the context of the study. 5. Methodology: It would help to elaborate on how the author assessed intent of self-harm? (Suicide assessment questionnaire could be useful) 6. Discussion: section is the core of any original research. Perhaps more enquiry into what is already studied in this topic and how this study adds to or challenges pre-existing findings will add value to this work. 7. There has been insufficient detailing around the mode of self-harm and its physical health consequences and management. 8. The role of gender or other person-specific socio-demographic variables which could act as confounding factors in the sample, has not been explored. 9. Conclusion: is not the same as summary. Adding practical implications to the findings would be helpful, instead of separate recommendations. Specific recommendations will be more useful than general ideas. 10. Inclusion of exact consent form could be in the form of an annexure, not main text. 11. Declare conflicts of interest and mention any acknowledgements. <p>YES – however, not comprehensively explained.</p> <p>Recommended seed articles: <i>Fliege, H., Lee, J. R., Grimm, A., & Klapp, B. F. (2009). Risk factors and correlates of deliberate self-harm behavior: A systematic review. Journal of psychosomatic research, 66(6), 477-493.</i> <i>Howarth, E. J., O'Connor, D. B., Panagioti, M., Hodkinson, A., Wilding, S., & Johnson, J. (2020). Are stressful life events prospectively associated with increased suicidal ideation and behaviour? A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Affective Disorders, 266, 731-742.</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	NO	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bhakti Murkey
Department, University & Country	Pacific Medical College and Hospital, India