

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJTDH_113998</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Burden of Tungiasis (jiggers' infestation) and Its Impact on Rural Vulnerable Populations in Kenya: A Comprehensive Health Assessment on Muranga County</b>
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes, Overall, the review provides valuable insights into the burden of tungiasis and potential strategies for addressing it.</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Not really, the review lacks clear section headings and subheadings, making it challenging for readers to navigate through the content. Clearly delineating sections such as Background, Health Impact, Public Health Efforts, and Recommendations would improve readability and comprehension.</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes, sufficient and recent</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes suitable BUT</p> <p>Conciseness: The review contains extensive detail, which may overwhelm readers and detract from the main points. To improve clarity, unnecessary repetition should be avoided, and information should be presented concisely.</p> <p>Language and Grammar: Some sentences are overly complex and difficult to understand, detracting from the clarity of the message. Simplifying the language and ensuring grammatical correctness would enhance readability.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Focus on Key Messages: The review could benefit from a clearer focus on key messages and take-home points. By prioritizing the most important information, readers can better grasp the significance of the topic and the proposed recommendations.</p> <p>Evidence-Based Recommendations: While the review offers recommendations for addressing tungiasis, these suggestions could be strengthened by providing evidence or examples of successful interventions in similar contexts. Including concrete examples would lend credibility to the proposed strategies.</p> <p>Engagement with Counterarguments: The review could benefit from acknowledging potential counterarguments or challenges to the proposed recommendations. Addressing potential critiques would demonstrate a more nuanced understanding of the issue and strengthen the overall argument.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yaman Walid Kassab</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>College of Pharmacy, National University of Science and Technology, Oman</b>