



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_29487
Title of the Manuscript:	AWARENESS, BELIEFS ON RISK FACTORS/AETIOLOGIES, AND ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS OF PRIMARY HEALTH CARE-RELATED DIPLOMA PROGRAMMES IN IBADAN, NIGERIA, TOWARDS BABIES WITH CLEFT LIP
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) Justification for the study was not stated 2) Revise the sentence in lines 26-27 3) If there are only four such schools in Ibadan, why did the author choose only three for the study. What is peculiar with the school left out 4) What were the student populations, and class numbers, of the study schools 5) Why did the author carry out the data collection during examination time, knowing fully well that data collection ought not to interfere with schedules of any study centre. 6) The recruited number (88) of participants fell short of the calculated sample size of 117. Was it proper for the author to go ahead and analyse the data? 7) The author did not review the curriculum content of the studied schools. This is quite important in order to determine the exposure of the students to the study subject 8) The author did not show the basic entry qualifications for the students of the schools/programmes. This is important in order to determine if the students should be compared. 9) Use of purposive recruitment was improper. 10) Why did the author not limit the study to final year students in order to ensure that all had been maximally exposed to the training curricula 11) Comparison of the findings from this study with that of Reference 14 is wrong because the study populations were quite different 12) The 4-point Likert scale should rather be 5-point, the	1) We have stated the justification of the study 2) We have revised the sentence in lines 26-27 in the manuscript 3) We did not select all the four schools, but conveniently selected only three out of four schools. The three schools selected were not far away from each other, but the fourth school is far away, so we selected just these three schools. This is because of our very limited financial resources. This study was self-funded and the principal investigator conducted it while as a student, out of his meagre stipends. This study was also conducted as a pilot study, with the aim of conducting bigger studies in future 4) The estimated targeted student population is 165 5) It was only the students in the School of Health Information Management (SHIM) that were about to have exams in a couple of days when the data was collected; students in the other two schools were not. It is not that the SHIM students were having exams when the data was collected. Students



SDI Review Form 1.6

	5th point being “don’t know”, which could have taken the place of “No response” in Table 1 13) Why did the author not collect data on the religious affiliations of the participants? This is important because religion plays a part in beliefs and related variables in this study. Religion could be a confounder in this study. Please clarify the ethical issue: 14) There was no Ethical Review Board approval for this study	there were given lecture-free days to prepare for their exams. So not all came to class. Some of the available SHIM students that came to school during this period excused themselves from participating because of this reason. 6) We went ahead to analyse the data despite the fact that we were short of the sample size. This was because we captured 75% of our sample size. 7. We did not review the curriculum of our respondents. 8. The basic qualifications of our study participants is a diploma certificate. 9. We used the word “purposive” to indicate that we deliberately limit our study population to those that have completed at least half of the duration of their training programme. We were not talking of a purposive sampling technique, but the rationale behind our participants' selection criteria: students that have completed at least half of the duration of their training programme. 10. We did not use only the final year students because of their small population size. 11. We have removed this aspect. There are dearth of papers on this study area 12. We did not use a 5-point Likert scale, we thought of it, but we do not want our participants to sit on the fence. We provided them with no opportunity of indecision. 13. We collect data on the religious affiliation of our respondents. We have included that in the result section. The majority (86%) of
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		the respondents were Christians; hence there is a very skewed distribution of religion of the participants. Comparing their religious status with this skewed distribution may not be reliable. Also, we will prefer to be silent about the relationship between religion and beliefs of the respondents; we do not want to compare any religion with the other. 14. We obtained our ethical approval from the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, Ibadan, Nigeria. All correspondence, including applications for ethical approval, to the Ministry must be to the honourable commissioner. The way we made reference to the Ministry is the widely used way in Nigerian studies. We will be very glad if we can stick to that. The letter given to us stated Ministry's approval. Thank you
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) Revise the p-value in line 143 2) Revise Reference 5	1. We have revised it 2. We have revised it.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Carry out a general grammar revision	We have done that. Thank you Sir/Ma for your review comments