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** *(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	**The topic of the current study is the "Evaluation of Health Inequity Status of In-School Youths in Uyo Capital Territory, Nigeria". The authors evaluated health inequity status of urban youths in a Niger Delta region of Nigeria. Specifically, the demographic profiles of the respondents were analysed, the pattern of health inequity indicants were ascertained and the pattern of index of health inequity status of the urban youths were assessed. The authors concluded that there is wide gap in health and socioeconomic wellbeing of the younger generation across the households.** **The topic of this study is interesting and the findings are valuable. The manuscript is written well and the findings are displayed clearly. There are only a few points to be revised which are listed in the section below.**	
Minor REVISION comments	- What does "N" (which is displayed in the last column of Table 1) refer to? It should be defined in the title of table 1. - What does "a, b, c, d" (which is displayed in the last column of Table 2) refer to? They should be defined in the title of table 2. - The format of the references is not uniform.	- The N has been removed though N referred to n=181 respondents. - a,b,c,d have been defined in the article - the format of the reference have been re-aligned