



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_27474
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Health Inequity Status of In-School Youths in Uyo Capital Territory, Nigeria.
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 <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	*Abstract: vague, non-informative. Nothing related to title *Introduction: long with many irrelevant topics (e.g. land use, environment,..), No study rationale, no study objectives *Methods: the most defective part of the study Nothing was mentioned about: -Study design, target population, sample size calculation, defective sampling method, study tool (contents, reliability & validity, language), data collection approach, Ethical consideration, data analysis. *Results & discussion: Just few socio-demographic data, inadequate interpretation of the findings, No study limitations Conclusion: irrelevant general statement *References: many outdated references	I completely disagree with this particular review. Though, our article is not be perfect as noted by reviewers: Tat, Nes and Met, I choose to stand by their comments which are totally and technically contradicting the opinions of this reviewer; Abd. Having gone through the write-up once more, I am of the position that the comments of Abd are totally misleading, subjective and not valid. He/she seems not to understand the focus of the article.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		