SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJTDH_27075**
Title of the Manuscript:	**How do metronidazole drawbacks impact patient compliance and therapeutic outcomes in treating amoebiasis in Rwanda**
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	**1. In Figure 1, The34.2% in the column of 'Good compliers' in the 'Total' item is incorrect. It should be 36.8% as stated in the text in Line 159.** **2. Line 74-86 'study Design', it only states that 115 students' questionnaire were retained for the study, can authors consider mentioning the total questionnaire sent, the total responded number and how many questionnaires were filtered out due to the unsatisfactory filling.** **3. Line 74-87 'study Design', any diagnostic criteria for the 'amoebiasis' of the recruited students. ?clinical ?stool or serology** **4. In result and discussion part, actually there is not obvious discussion over causal relationship of the metronidazole side effects and the noncompliance of the treatment (which should be the paper title and primary outcome), can the authors consider trying to attempt to demonstrate any relationship between the side effects and compliance (?more side effects causing less compliance)**	
Minor REVISION comments	1. **Line 178-184, attempt to discuss the Entamoeba histolytica resistance to metronidazole in vitro and to H. pylori. Comments : 1. Drug resistance is not very related to the title of study and the study result 2, so far there is no strong evidence the in vitro metronidazole resistance of E. histolytica causing a major clinical management concern. 3.**	

	Metronidazole resistance of H. pylori is not relevant to the clinical discussion of this paper.	
Optional/General comments	1. The result and the discussion cannot target on the paper title/ major clinical question very well. Discussion should focus more on how the side effects may reduce the patient's compliance and thus clinical response. 2. Strong cofounding factors in the results (noncompliant patients think the drug is bad, compliant patients think the drug is good) 3. Lack of objective definition of case diagnosis, clinical improvement.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Sai Wah Cheung**
Department, University & Country	**Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Department of Medicine and Geriatrics, Tuen Mun Hospital, Hong Kong**