



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_14182
Title of the Manuscript:	Risk Factors of Human African Trypanosomiasis in Mbuji Mayi, Eastern Kasai Province, Democratic Republic of the Congo
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	This is potentially an interesting manuscript but in its current form it's not suitable for publication. To go into detail would take too much time, I will just outline some key issues. - The manuscript is very long (almost 7000 words) with a lot of information that is irrelevant for the study question. - In lines 225-230 the authors state that controls were matched for: sex, residence, age, professional activity (with three modalities: farming, trading in rural areas, and diamond digging), involvement in activities connected with the river (modalities: dish or cloth washing, fetching water for domestic use, and diamond digging), environment of one's residence (proximity of diamond mining, of swamps and farming, of savanna or of river) and knowledge about HAT transmission mechanism (bite by tsetse fly). If indeed controls have been matched in this way, it is not possible to study the factors identified in table 2 because they are all matching factors. - The statements in line 411 to 415 on effectiveness of active case finding in urban areas are not related to the results presented nor to the study objectives listed in lines 207-210. Please note that for the manuscript to be suitable for publication a thorough revision is required addressing more than just the three issues I listed here.	Thank you for finding this manuscript interesting! While we agree with your criticism about some irrelevant sections - - which we have managed to remove - - , we disagree with your suggestion that the manuscript is too long. As well-published authors we have submitted various original research manuscripts elsewhere which were longer than the text of the present study and which were published. Additionally, none of the three other reviewers has raised a similar issue regarding the length of the text. The statement in lines 411 to 415 (original text) was removed, as this was clearly suggested by three reviewers. However, because of the requests made by the other reviewers - - such as the creation of various sub-sections in the introduction section and the addition of a conclusion section - - and our goodwill effort to satisfy their request, the overall length of the manuscript has increased. We feel this increase adds value and clarity to the paper. Doing this has increased the overall size of the manuscript from 7000 words to about 10,000 words! The statement in lines 225-230 of the original text was erroneous; it has been corrected to reflect that matching was done only on the basis of residence, age, and gender. This clarification is provided in lines 320-321 of the newer text. We agree with your suggestion to remove the section on effectiveness of active case finding in urban areas. This was removed. As we have mentioned elsewhere, we have addressed the various issues clearly raised by the reviewers. This last request is a very broad request to complete a "thorough revision." We would have appreciated a more precise listing of the issues to address.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The fact that study participants provided verbal consent (line 252) doesn't mean much since they were all interviewed.	As researchers we had secured approval by an IRB committee before data collection. The approved protocols include our data collection procedures. Our statement regarding the verbal consent is indicative of our compliance with that stipulation. We are not aware of a change in this practice and we do not understand why such a description is being resented here.