

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_120782
Title of the Manuscript:	AWARENESS OF ZIKA VIRUS DISEASE EFFECTS ON CHILDREN, AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS INFECTED UNBORN BABIES, AMONG CAREGIVERS THAT VISIT IMMUNIZATION CLINIC OF A TEACHING HOSPITAL, ENUGU, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it sheds light on the awareness levels and attitudes towards Zika virus infection in a region where such data is limited. Understanding these factors is crucial for developing effective public health interventions and educational campaigns. The study's findings highlight the need for improved education and awareness campaigns, which can inform future research and policy-making efforts to prevent and manage Zika virus infections. I appreciate that this manuscript tackles a relevant public health issue and provides original data from a specific geographic location, contributing valuable insights to the field. However, the methodological limitations including sample size calculation and statistical analysis methods need to be addressed to strengthen the impact and reliability of the findings.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title is a bit long. Here are a few alternative titles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Zika Virus Awareness and Attitudes Among Caregivers in Enugu, Nigeria ii. Zika Virus: Knowledge Gaps and Healthcare Seeking Behaviors in Nigeria 	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is generally well-structured, covering essential elements such as the aims, study design, place, duration, methodology, and a brief mention of results. It can be further refined for clarity and completeness, such as</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Adding key percentages and figures from the results would make the abstract more informative. b. Conclusion: A brief conclusion summarizing the key findings and their implications would enhance the abstract. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to have a generally appropriate structure.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates several aspects of scientific rigor:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The study employs a quantitative, observational, cross-sectional design, which is appropriate for assessing awareness and attitudes in a specific population at a given time. ii. The methodology appears well-defined, with a clear sampling strategy and data collection process using structured interviews. iii. The sample size of 256 participants, while not explicitly justified through power calculations, is substantial enough to provide meaningful insights into the target population. The results are presented systematically, with awareness scores and attitude percentages clearly reported, allowing for objective interpretation of the findings. <p>In addition, the discussion effectively highlights the importance of continuous public health education on Zika virus, demonstrating the study's relevance and significance in the field. However, to further enhance its scientific robustness, the manuscript would benefit from more detailed statistical analysis and a thorough discussion of potential biases and limitations.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>Should be ok.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The overall language and English quality of this article appears to be suitable for scholarly communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	David Ho
Department, University & Country	China