SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_IJTDH_11595**
Title of the Manuscript:	**NASOPHARYNGYEAL CARRIAGE AND ANTIMICROBIAL SUSCEPTIBILITY OF STREPTOCOCCUS PNEUMONIAE, IN CHILDREN UNDER FIVE YEARS AT MBARARA REGIONAL REFERRAL HOSPITAL, UGANDA**
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:

(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** *(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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	In general the topic described in the manuscript is interesting. However, major revision is required to strengthen the manuscript in order to consider it for publication. The prevalence of *Streptococcus pneumonia* in the cohort tested was only 19%, where lab tests done to identify which were the other pathogens present? If so this needs to be included in the manuscript. The authors cannot soley rely on a phenotypic characterization since some strains are not easily distinguished this way. A molecular confirmatory tests should have been done. This can be included as a limitation to the study. Data should have been collected on previous infections such as otitis media. Other risk factors that should have been discussed: Is the mum currently breastfeeding the child Does the child attend daycare Did the child have an ear infection in the past 3 months Please see Levine et al 1999 and Anthony et al 2012. The discussion needs to be richer, the significance for the drug resistance needs to be emphasized. The relevance for this study is not shown. The authors donot make any	

	recommendations based on their findings that could have a public health impact such as surveillance monitoring etc.	
	Introduction: Lines 27-28: provide the citation Lines 27-28: "inexpensive antibiotics" is the author referring to generic antibiotics or incorrect dosage antibiotics.	Comment noted for action
	Line 30: replace "scanty" with limited Lines 32-34 should rather read: " this study was carried out to determine the prevalence of *Streptococcus pneumoniae* in young children in South Western Uganda"	Noted
	Methods: Lines 154-155 of the discussion should be included in methods section to describe the study population. Lines 44-46: which Micro lab did the testing? Lines 66-67: please remove, this is a repetition of the statement line 64.	Noted
	Results: This section is poorly written and needs attention.	
	Where is table 1? The manuscript begins with Table 2. Tables need to be re-formatted, for table 2, some stats should have been done and a p-value generated to show if there is a level of significance across the different categories, since this table is purely descriptive.	Comment noted
	What is the significance of the question? Member of house mate treated with antibiotic?	

	There is an error in category : No. of house occupants Age rather than number of occupants is represented. Passive smoking is not a significant variable since passive smoking and infection is only applicable in adults (18-64 years of age). See Nuorti et al 2000. The caption for Table 3 needs to be changed. Table 3: OR should be written in full (Odds Ratio) CI written in full. A category on gender of child should have been included in this analysis since gender plays a major role in diseases acquisition as evidence by other published findings around this subject matter. Lines 126 is incorrect, there is no association between variables and potential infection or microorganisms present. **Discussion:** Lines 172-173: this statement does make sense, please clarify. **Limitation:** Line 176 some, few studies, this is a contradiction, please correct.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	There are numerous grammatical and typographical errors and sentence construction that needs urgent attention. The manuscript needs to be formatted, check line spacing, there are inconsistencies Be consistent with numbers in the text, either write as a number or write in full e.g sixty months or 60 months	