



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_24051
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Two Survey Methods based on Response Distribution of Pediatricians in India: Mail versus Telephone
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Interesting topic for research however this manuscript needs a lot of revisions pertaining to sampling statistics to ensure cofounders are controlled for in both samples Introduction: • References needed for ALL statements on lines 17 to 28. • References needed for types of errors discussed on lines 29-31 • References needed for statement on lines 38-41 • Line 82 clarify "international setting"; what does that mean? • Line 83: clarify the target population • Elaborate on the goal of the study by further describing type of survey, population and	Introduction 1. We have included five additional references for statements on lines 17-28, please see manuscript 2. We have included additional references for types of errors, please see manuscript 3. We have added references to the statement on lines 38-41, please see manuscript 4. By "international setting" we mean non-United States, but also a developing country. We have modified the sentence which now reads, "... in a developing country, India, that controls ..." 5. We recognize the ambiguity of this term and have removed it from the sentence 6. We have added additional information on study population, setting, and survey. The section now reads, "The goal of this study is to provide an evidence-based statistical comparison of two survey methods (mail versus telephone) in a developing country,



SDI Review Form 1.6

	setting METHODS/RESULTS • Clarify how randomness of samples was ensured? • Line 114: describe the survey team? Who was conducting the interviews (whats their background, how many..) • What kind of training the survey team received? • Describe the phone interviews ; when were physicians' called? During work hours? After hours? • Describe the mail survey.. when were the mails sent? Any reminder systems? • Line 118: the study period was 1 year. How was the work divided over this year? Did physicians received calls the entire year? • Line 149: explain how "expected	India, among pediatricians in private practice who are members of the Indian Academy of Pediatrics that controls for survey design and determine whether there is a difference in the response distribution between the two survey modes. Participants were sampled from across India and the survey questions were regarding immunization of children in India" METHODS/RESULTS 1. We added the following statement to the methods section, "The allocation sequence for the randomization was generated done using the SAS routine RANUNI and subsequent sorting procedure. 2. We have added the following information about the survey team, "The survey team was based out of St. Stephen's Hospital Community Health Department where they conduct both urban and rural health surveys and provide education and health services based on the need of the communities. The survey team was made up of six members with varying educational backgrounds, including
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	responses” were planned to be obtained? • Provide baseline characteristics of physicians surveyed • How did you ensure the different samples were identical? Did you match for age, gender, years of practice... Those are important factors that can influence responses; need to control for those variables DISCUSSION: Line 232-234: inaccurate statement; “random sample” is not the only factor that might influence the results and the assumption made on attributing the results found to the survey type is an over simplification. Need to look at other cofounders like physicians’ characteristics (age, gender, years in practice...) Need to discuss the latter before coming up with the postulated conclusion.	MBBS.” 3. We have added the following to provide more detail on the training of the survey team, “The survey team was trained by the senior author (LMG) using a script was developed by the study team with input from the survey team. The protocol and the data entry form was developed prior to the study starting. During a site visit, the survey team reviewed the protocol and were able to ask questions for clarification. At this time, the team practiced the scripts and the survey on other team members.” 4. We have added the following to further describe the phone and mail survey, “For both groups, members selected for participation first received a telephone call to solicit their participation using the contact information provided by the national IAP office. During this call, persons randomized to the mail survey were asked for the best location for them to receive mail. Persons in the telephone group were asked if they presently had time to complete the survey, or if there was a convenient time for them to be called back. Persons in the mail group who accepted the invitation to
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

		participate were called up to two more times to encourage them to send in their responses. Persons in the phone group were called two additional times before being considered unreachable. If no telephone was available for those in the mail survey, a letter was mailed with the survey to the address on file with IAP. Persons in both groups received a letter signed by the IAP president thanking them for their participation.” 5. The entire study time was 1 year, this included obtaining member information from IAP, sample selection, training survey teams, conducting surveys, data entry and cleaning, analysis, and manuscript writing. The phone calls were made during about 6-8 months of this time, allowing time in between calls if multiple attempts were needed as well as reminder calls for the mail survey. 6. Line 149 is an error – we have corrected it to read “Were there any statistically significant differences between the telephone responses compared to the mail responses, and if so, by how many percentage
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		points.” 7. Unfortunately, the data received from IAP does not include information on the member, such as the ones the reviewer suggests (age, gender, years in practice) so we are unable to provide baseline characteristics or control for these factors. We had this as a limitation but have further expanded it to read, “this sample does not take into account the characteristics of pediatricians, such as gender, years in practice, age” DISCUSSION 1. Line 232-234: Since we are unable to examine other cofounders like age, gender, years of practice, etc., we have moved this statement so it follows discussion of this limitation.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		