



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_32823
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiological Trend of Lassa Fever and Insight for the Control of Future Outbreaks in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Review paper

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	<u>The abstract is not appropriate</u>, The author(s) focused on generalities instead of summarizing their paper. Line 10 to 15: You stated about this in the introduction Line 37 to 38. That is more appropriate in the introduction. OK! Get back to your abstract and change it! Line 54-55: into Old World Lymphocytic Choriomeningitis Virus (LCMV) Lassa virus (LASV), Before using abbreviations, give the full name of the virus followed by abbreviations into brackets as I suggest in yellow! Your introduction also state about generalities that better move in discussion, instead of planning the next presented study. I cannot point out any part of the introduction that indicates the specific aspects that will be discussed in this paper. <u>The introduction is not appropriate!</u>	This has been looked into, adjusted and corrected. See lines 10-27 Already corrected This has been taken care of. See lines 61-62 This has been addressed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Lines 12-13; Lines 36-38; Lines 69-70. All state about the same thing! Line 68: The Biology of the Virus The molecular background you gave here must be summarized. They do not bring any useful strategy for the <u>epidemiological trends</u> you are stating about. Line 86: The Vector - I would say the reservoir species Line 107: Historical Epidemiological Trend of Lassa Fever in Nigeria Line 108 same words as in the abstract line 10! Lines 121-130: You are doing an epidemiological review: Then give number of people infected, number of died persons, etc... and analyze the increasing incidence till line 131. Give rates as for lines 131-135. <u>Table 1 gives localities and dates but not informative about Lassa incidence!</u> Lines 148-149: I would gave the names of those endemic countries	This has been corrected This has summarized. See lines 77-84 This has been effected. See line 159 Already corrected Already captured. See lines 194-202 The incidence is already captured in lines 194-202 and 234-238 while the table only summarises dates and endemic regions.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	A BACKGROUND chapter just after the introduction should state about the first Lassa virus description from that nurse, give generalities about the RNA viruses and the reservoir host, <i>Mastomys natalensis</i>. Then a chapter as Epidemiology of Lassa fever in Nigeria can be developed ...And discussed for West Africa. Overall the paper looks confusing to me, with several information gathered but that need to be re-arranged and rephrased. I spent sometimes reviewing a previous paper from the same source, but at the end I was not able to bring any statement about. Line 26 Abstract: You state that there is no <u>vaccine for Lassa Fever</u>. Line 259-260 Production of a combined, single <u>dose vaccine against yellow fever and Lassa</u> fever has been proposed (31). It is confusing !! Line 284 and 289 : repetition!	This has been modified All corrections have been effected and corrected For now, there is no vaccine yet for LASSA but a proposed vaccine which will be of immense benefits for the ravaging regions and for all This has been corrected. See lines 377-402
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		