

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRID_81708 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | SOCIO- DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS INFLUENCING THE OWNERSHIP AND UTILIZATION OF LONG LASTING INSECTICIDE NETS AMONG ENDEMIC SUB-COUNTIES IN KISII COUNTY |
| 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://journalsajp.com/index.php/SAJP/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

| | 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> |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>This article is about factors associated with ITN ownership and use in a single county in Kenya. The study itself could be well-done and might be useful in this specific county, but the writing is difficult to parse and the conclusions aren't really related to the findings. As I live in East Africa, I am somewhat used to this style of writing and can understand it, but most people will not be able to. I suggest the writers get a native English speaker to review this as well as a statistician to help them interpret the findings and do a solid rewrite. There are also too many figures and sections – the authors need to focus on their main message and show only the data that support this. It reads like a thesis/protocol at this point.</p> <p>Title – I can't tell what country this is occurring in. Same for the abstract. The authors need to be aware that people outside their country will not know Kisii county. Please specify country.</p> <p>General comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This paper needs a good review for grammar and formatting, from the start to the finish • Keywords: sociodemographic is not a keyword; it applies to many different situations <p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same comment, please – specify country. Also, people will have no idea what the places are 'Bonchari, Kitutu Chache, etc.' – are these subcounties? Cities? Villages? What is the significance of the dispensaries? Are they the only dispensaries in these villages? It's really hard to assess the meaning of these without a little more context. • Methods: How did you collect the data? In-person interviews at the dispensaries? Which household member did you interview? What did you ask about? It isn't clear from this what the unit of analysis is – is it the individual or the household? What outcome are you interested in? • No need to spell out SPSS. • Round your %ages to the nearest %. There's little value in knowing the difference between 68.69% and 69%, but it makes it easier for the reader to digest when they see 69%. • For binary outcomes (X had LLINs and Y had no LLINs; N had torn LLINs and M had no torn LLINs), only report one side of the analysis (X had LLINs, N had torn LLINs). It's obvious that the inverse of these statements (Y had no LLINs) is true and it doesn't need to be stated explicitly. • When you state associations, you need to state the direction and specifics of the association. For example, "there was an association between LLINs per household and age" – meaning older people had more LLINs per household? Which household member? Or younger people had more LLINs per household?. Same with 'level of education' – meaning more educated people | |

Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>had more LLINs? Which household member are you referring to? “Location” – what about location? Residence? Village? Which village had households with more LLINs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conclusion is not directly related to the findings. It isn't clear at all that sociodemographics influence ownership and utilization of LLINs based on what is shown in the abstract. How does regular training (of whom?) influence sociodemographics? <p>The rest of this paper needs such substantial cutting.</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Optional/General 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: | Julie R. Harris |
| Department, University & Country | Georgia |