



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_32540
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigating associative impact of Indoor Residual Spray and Insecticide Treated Nets for minimizing Visceral leishmaniasis vector population in Bihar (India).
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	T This manuscript attempted to document the extent of visceral Leishmaniasis in Bihar state of India. The authors have shown the deficiencies in the strategy of reduction of the vectors of this disease by the IRS. The authors therefore propose to evaluate a combination of IRS + ITNs in the control of vectors as an alternative. This strategy is original but the manuscript has deficiencies that authors should consider to ensure understanding of the manuscript his manuscript attempted to document the extent of visceral Leishmaniasis in Bihar state of India. The paper is rather long for the information provided and I think it could be shortened in some areas without impairing its main messages. Introduction 1. The authors do not show in their manuscript the previous results of the use of the IRS in the strategy of prevention of VL as insufficient to the point that it is necessary to add nets; 2. The authors did not mention in the	• Thank you reviewer for going through the manuscript in detail and interpreting its theme and message so nicely. Now, the manuscript has undergone major revision (as per suggestions received from rest of the reviewer of this journal) for covering up all the facets existed in the manuscript as well as convincing the readers. Hope for the reviewer's satisfaction with the revised version of Manuscript. • Though the manuscript is bit long but contains all the reports and data very relevant and worthy for the present study addressing for accessing the field efficacy trials of IRS and ITN alone as well as combined strategy for reducing VL vector population, feeding pattern, effectiveness perceived, adverse events and additive benefits from the combined interventions of IRS alongwith ITN as compared to IRS and ITNs alone. • The Introduction section has now been completely changed and thoroughly revised with new and much convincing and impactful informations with updated references cited. Hope, this may satisfy reviewer's query as well readers' thirst for this research information.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	manuscript why the choice of PermaNet 3.0 and not another; - The authors should specify in their manuscript whether previous studies have been conducted with IRS + ITNs in the locality or in a neighboring country in the VL control. - Page 2, Lines 32-33: I don't understand this sentence at all. Material and Methods - Methods was not enough described; - It is very difficult to read and understand. I suggest to refund Material and Methods in three distinct parts after study sites and study period part: - Baseline survey (before intervention) - Intervention part - Post-intervention NB: At each part, describe correctly the applied methodology - Page 3, Line 90: 255? What? specify - Page 4, Line 136: Data entry and analysis should be the last chapter in the material and methods section - What was the type of mosquito net used in the mosquito net intervention only? Specify. - Did you not seek the consent of the population before your intervention? Why?	- Extensive editing has been incorporated in the section to meet the expectations of reviewers. Hope, it will satisfy the reviewer's query as well as reader's thirst for this research information. - Corrected as per the reviewer's instruction - Corrected as per the reviewer's instruction - Detailed in section 2.5 i.e., Insecticide Treated Nets. - Yes, we had already obtained the needful consent before the initiation of study at the selected sites. For this, door-to-door surveys were conducted by the trained interviewers using questionnaire sheet, purposely designed for obtaining information regarding socio-economic status of householders and the protective measures taken against nuisance of insects. Also, after getting approval from the House hold owners only, we moved for the assessment of sand fly density via installation of Light Traps or conducting manual collection through aspirator. These are well detailed in the MS under
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Results 1. Refound results based on the new presentation of the Material and Methods part 2. Resume Table 1, specifying the key aspects 3. Table 4 is very confused. 4. Make comments of Table 5 in the text and deleted Table 5. Discussions 1. Summary of findings, strengths and limitations, comparisons with other studies and yours conclusions 2. Implications of the study. I think readers would be interested to know what the authors think are the implications of the study, presumably the purpose of undertaking the survey. 3. Were the findings presented to the respective national Visceral leishmaniasis control programme and, if so, what was their reaction?	section Baseline interview survey. • Result section has been updated now as in accordance with reviewer's suggestion. • The mentioned section i.e., Discussion and Conclusion section has been completely changed now citing new references relevant to the present study and are incorporated the revised manuscript. • As stated in the 1. Introduction section as well as in 7. Ethical Approval section that 'The study was approved in year 2013 with title 'Integrated vector management for the VL control vis-a-vis case study – A Pilot study' by the Scientific Advisory Committee as well as Ethical Committee of Rajendra Memorial Research Institute of Medical Sciences (ICMR), Government of India in year 2013 with study reference no. INT 98 VBC 2013' The results have been shared with the National Vector Borne Disease Control Programme (NVBDGP) – the nodal agency for vector borne disease of Government of India. They were very much satisfied with the result as well they appreciated the technique(s) adopted for validating the proposed hypothesis.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Correct throughout the manuscript spelling mistakes	Taken proper care while doing the complete revision of present revised version of manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		