



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Lines 156-165 and 196-231 just explain Tables 1and 2, respectively, item by item (repeatedly) without adding author's any analytical comments. Please add authors' comments, idea and opinions more to these results. 2. Explain the original form of the survey current questionnaire and replying results more detail as Table2 may not be enough to be understood by the readers. 3. Add "cross factor" analyses rather than current single-factor analysis in order to answer e.g. the following questions such as "what kind of people do go to the clinic?", "Are these people in higher healthy conditions compared with others?", "what kind of people feel bad frequently?" and so on. Try to characterize people who have certain and typical behavioural trends.	With regards to 1. The authors had already provided discussion in respect of lines 156-165 as shown on lines 167 to 188. Also the discussion of lines 196-231 were presented on lines 233 to 245. With regards to 2. The suggestions were not clear and specific however, I believe the subtitle has focus and quite insightful to the understanding of a potential reader. With regards to 3. This reviewer opinion are within the context of this subcomponent which was basically on pattern of incidences and their ranking. The questions suggested would constitute another study other than the objectives we had set forth to answer, which had done.
<u>-Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In Table 2, items 6,7,18 and 21 show "double negative" expression. Thus explanation based upon replies "never", "often" make us confuse. Please express all in rather affirmative style. 2. Line 221 and 222 duplicated.	Thank you for the observation it has been deleted and some of necessary item adjustments made.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Current version of the draft does not meet minimum standard required for the academic journal. It needs more analyses on the survey results.	This is so sad to read about "minimum standard required....." so subjective thought orientation. May you permit me to ask if there is any baseline with respect to number of the analysis required for article to make an academic journal. This study was exploratory research, seeking to establish baselines incidences in the study area. My opinion is that we set forth our objectives and we had fulfilled all objectives even though we adopted descriptive analytical tools to reveal salient information about the study area.