



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_38025
Title of the Manuscript:	MENINGOCOCCAL MENINGITIS OUTBREAK (OF 2009) AMONG CHILDREN IN MAIDUGURI NORTH-EASTERN NIGERIA: EPIDEMIOLOGY AND DETERMINANTS OF OUTCOME
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	Page2: line 69-71, study objectives are to prospectively describe clinical features, determinants of treatment outcome and epidemiologic characteristics, please be matched these objectives, results and title of the manuscript. Page 3 Patients and methods, line 81~, if a new case occur in different area where not affected outbreak region and excluded this study, it may and may cause bias. Page 4: Results, flow chart need to be created as a figure and explain it. Page 5: 1) line 143-148, it would be better if number or percent listed in order. 2) line 157, table 1-4 explained briefly, please be advised to explain more detail and major findings. All tables, please make consistency with order, for example, p-value column, reference and other classified variables. Page 9: 1) line 224-line 232, this paragraph is redundant part, so please consider deleting repeated explanation. 2) I can't find any description of figure 1. I assume that it has important information such as reasons of decreased in July and re-rising from September, Page 12: 1) line 272-274, please add some explanation of all year-round occurrence. 2) line 284~, it is unclear, please rewrite. 3) in discussion, please describe major findings first and explain any specific explanation	Page 2, I have modified some of the title of the tables to reflect the statement objecties e.g. table reads; Univariate analysis of patients EPIDEMIOLOGIC CHARACTERISTICS. Table 2 reads; CLINICAL FEATURES OF PATIENTS WITH MENINGOCOCCAL MENINGITIS. Table 3. Reads; CENTRAL NERVOUS SYSTEM (CNS) CLINICAL SIGNS REGRESSION ANALYSIS. Table 4. INTERVENTION BEFORE EVALUATION AT EMERGENCY PAEDIATRIC UNIT (EPU). Table 5.reads; MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF FACTORS DETERMINING MORTALITY Page 3, line 81; I believe we had taken care of the possibility because we entertained it, so we followed the study up to a year and a shown in figure 2, the outbreak came to stop by December after the raining season. Page 4; it has been converted to "figure 1"accordingly Page 5: 1) Line 143-148, It has re-numbered in order of high frequency to low frequency. 2) we have attempted to explain each table briefly see page 4-5, line 140-155 in text and where the table is self-explanatory we left it as such. Page 9: 1) I have deleted some terms out and re-organise the sentences to make it more meaningful. 2) Yes, it was an omission so has been rectified on page 4, line 138-141. It has become figure 2 now, I have deleted figure and made the flow chart as figure 1 as suggested by one of the reviewers. Page 12: 1) Line 272-274, It was stated that prior to the outbreak, vaccination was not carried out in the region for more than two years that may have contributed 2) Line 284. It was meant to compare finding in this work with other work elsewhere in similar "meningitis belt" 3) Thank you, in the discussion, we have discussed along these line; 1. Epidemiology generally, 2. Children's neglect in epidemiologic documentation, 3. The finding in this study, such intervention prior to admission, treatment with CHL/CRYST. PEN and CFX/GEN, 4. Other factors that affected the treatment outcome, in nutshell.
Minor REVISION comments	Page 13: line 320-325, this sentence is not clear, please make clearer.	Page 13: line 320-325, "Maiduguri and Azare towns were inserted" which was omitted initially. Also last sentence was recasted.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	This manuscript is about meningitis outbreak in 2009. Generally, this study reports epidemiologic patterns and risk factors, however, it requires to be revised as commented above. Only one tertiary hospital can be representative of this outbreak? If there is some certain differential factors or major findings, please describe and emphasize them. Also, please describe tables and figures in result section instead of discussion. In contents, please explain why any sequelae information is available.	I have attempted the necessary correction as requested by the reviewer. Also with respect to whether one tertiary hospital work was a representative of the outbreak at the time, but at the time we got the most ill patients referred to the centre. Attention was much toward to outbreak. Since it was during an epidemic, after discharge we did not follow the patients for long, we saw them at first follow up visit and as documented we did not saw any major complication. The statistic here are principally that of case management from admission until discharge or expired.
---	---	--