



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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	INTRODUCTION 1. To be removed to the paragraph: from line 64 to 84. 2. Situation of HAT in DRC as stated from line 87 to 101 should be put directly after line 30. STUDY SETTING 1. To be removed: from line 152 to 165 as there is no link between the acquisition of HAT and political organization of a city. 2. Paragraph titled "Economy and living conditions" should be put together and titled "socio-economic conditions". In that paragraph, socio-economic level of populations should be described. STUDY JUSTIFICATION AND AIMS The purpose of identifying risk factors of HAT in Mbuji-May I is not well clarified. A discussion section must be included in the paper. Do not repeat results in the interpretation section.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Name of species and sub species should be written in italic. Reference number should be put before the full stop outstanding the end of the sentence. MATERIAL AND METHODOLOGY: As there is no list of material used, the word Material should be removed.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This paper provides good information as regards risk factors of HAT in Mbuji-May I, a sub urban focus. Despite encouraging efforts, sleeping sickness is still endemic in many areas in DRC. Knowledge of transmission modalities could improve disease control. As a matter of accuracy, note that conclusion section in regular articles is made of only few sentences found at the end of the paper. Findings are interpreted in a section called "Discussion". Authors should clarify the study-design process. Were the 60 HAT cases selected only in the basis of their positivity after CATT test or also after parasitological test? Which parasitological test allows the diagnosis of infected patients? It should have been better for authors to provide also data about the presence or not of tsetse flies in areas frequented by populations during their activities. For ethical issues, why do authors not used a written consent and allows parents (adults) for children under 18 to sign it? Authors should rewrite the discussion section titled "conclusion" by avoiding repetition of data already shown in results section. This manuscript should be given to an English speaking person to correct the English mistakes. Other remarks can be found in the manuscript. A written consent should have been better.	
--	--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kohagne tongue Lisette
Department, University & Country	Institut de Recherche en Ecologie Tropicale (IRET)/Libreville, Gabon ; Université Catholique d'Afrique Centrale (UCAC)/ Yaoundé, Cameroun