



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_33303
Title of the Manuscript:	Health and Communicable Disease in West Khasi Hill District
Type of the 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	The title needs more detail about the country where the study was conducted. At least, I suggest to mention at the end, the name of the country, otherwise is not clear for the reader, where exactly these villages could be located in the world. In fact, in any part of the manuscript it is mentioned. Methodology: the authors refer they use GIS, which I understood they used to create the maps, otherwise there is no mention about the software you use for calculation of frequencies etc. In fact, I think the study has enough information to input in softwares such excel or epiinfo to get results by analysing different variables. The study was based on surveys, nonetheless, there is no a description about the exclusion and inclusion criteria, for example, is not clear whether the person under survey is suffering Malaria at the moment of the survey or he/she refers to have malaria a time ago. Which are the criteria to consider a person currently with Malaria (only for symptoms? There is a doctor that participates in the survey in order to confirm the symptoms?) Results: The first table should be improved due to its difficulty to understand. I think the table 1 can be even more elaborated. The name of the disease is better to break down Maps: I consider there is such a excessive number of maps which at the end instead of make the idea more clear led to more confusion. I suggest replacing the other maps for Malaria, and	The researched was done during the year 2009-2011 in the remote villages situated in North Eastern part of India. The survey was conducted on a verbal personal interview with the households. So as a result, lack of information or details (about how they suffer? Or what are the causes? Or is there any medical-practioners along? As requested for your information. The answer is NO! Why?) Because at the time of the survey there were no doctors and so this was done through a door-to-door study research amongst these households from grass root level and also the data collected at that time was about the people suffering in a year. The first table shows the number of households who suffered from different numbers of diseases in a year (The number of diseases refers to the type of diseases that people usually suffered in a year) The map provided has been reduced from the previous. Bars chat is difficult to show all the 28 villages where the population suffered from any diseases. The maps show better result for all the 28 villages and different age group of people who suffered from any communicable



SDI Review Form 1.6

	other diseases for bars charts. Table: I strongly suggest to follow the format of the tables of the journal Discussion: I strongly suggest to separate this from the results, otherwise, by reading, there is a repetition of the results again and there is a lack of real discussion based on references of previous works and the present situation of the local health policies. Ethical Issue: There is no mention about whether the protocol of this study was accepted or not by any ERB	disease.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Check again the full manuscript, there is some words written wrongly and there is a lack of space between words to words.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The work shows a very useful information for public health policies to local level.	