



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_26552
Title of the Manuscript:	EBOLA VIRUS DISEASE: RISK PERCEPTION AND GAPS IN COMPLIANCE WITH INFECTION CONTROL PRACTICES AMONG MORTUARY WORKERS IN TWO SOUTH* WESTERN CITIES OF 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	In abstract: Study design, place and duration of study should come under methodology. In the conclusion: Selected training and on job professional courses are needed. In introduction: Update the introduction and outbreak data since the manuscript is written on 12th Feb 15. Provide some definitions for Risk perception, and its role for behavioral changes. In the last sentence of the last paragraph; might be appropriate to state the ultimate objective if current study. In methodology section: It is an analytical cross-sectional study and not only descriptive, since the authors performed bivariate analysis to assess association between exposure and outcome. Include this correction in the abstract section as well. Make further summary of area description, it is now	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	look un-necessarily long and detailed with facts not really relevant to study objectives. The sampling technique is two stages sampling (1st stage SRS for LGAs and the 2nd stage is total coverage for all participants. This should be reflected in the abstract as well. You may need to move ethical sentence from the method section in line "59" to the subheading Ethical considerations in line "209". Provide reference number and dates for Ethical approval if available. In line "72": I would suggest replacing the sub-heading by: Study outcomes determination. In Result: In line "99": Separate results from discussion, it would be easier for the reader to concentrate in each separately. In line "111": describe the way of practiced hand washing (was as per infection control guideline?? Or just hand washing?) In line "116": remove the word "cited" in line number to avoid confusion with citation from other studies. You may need to perform bivariate analysis to assess the association between participant's characteristics and all outcomes such as what you already done for	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	risk perception. I mean do it for Knowledge and PPEs adherence as well. All results could be summarized more under subheadings; to make it easier for the reader. In discussion: You may need to discuss the statistically significant variables associated with outcomes such as Location/Abadan, public health facilities with risk perception; what are the possible explanations? Because this might help in putting down practical recommendations based on lesson learned from these variables. In conclusion: You may summarize some practical recommendations based on results of data analysis mainly from the bivariate analysis. Induction trainings for new recruitments in addition to continuous professional development trainings and supervision/monitoring systems by responsible public health authorities could be one of the important outcomes/recommendations of this study. Ethical considerations: Under this subheading you may make some points regarding ethical approval and move consent part here under this heading instead of line "204".	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	For references: All within text citations and bibliography are in need to be formatted according to the journal style. Additional references could be provided in the discussion part mainly after showing results of bivariate analysis for association between baseline characteristics and outcomes.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	need to go through minor language editing. The layout of the manuscript needs improvement by choosing appropriate subheadings and avoids unnecessary repetitions. Ethical issue: major issues since the study included participants who provided their consents to participate and no specific data or information might harm any of them.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript and study topic are of great interest and need to be published after improvement.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed A. Soghaier
Department, University & Country	Department of epidemiology and zoonotic diseases, Federal Ministry of Health, Sudan