



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_34810
Title of the Manuscript:	The Pattern and Trend of Non-Communicable Diseases in Children in Jos, North Central Nigeria: A Four-Year Review
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Abstract Review; Categorical data was analysed using student t test while continuous variables were analysed with the chi square test. See also lines 54 and 55. Prevalence of what ranged from 20.5% -40.5%. Include Jos and North central Nigeria as keywords. Make a better description of the study area. P value is a probability, Line 85 should be $p < 0.001$. Use the guideline of the Journal as it concerns Referencing	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Review; those with inconclusive and neonates were excluded. (Abstract) Line 12; include and between children and capable Review Lines 23- 25, also remove the 'second' these deaths. Line 27 should be deaths from NCDs Review Line 30. Review the use of NCD and NCDs Line 34; allocate resources to areas that are needed please review this part of the statement. Line 40 conclusions from this study	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Were AKI and CKD introduced before use. check for others. Line 67 change is to was. Review Line 67 -69. It should be a higher proportion of males were affected with NCDs when compared with the females and the difference in proportions was not found to be statistically significant. Include the proportions and the p value. Table 1&2 should be Disease. Present Table 3 appropriately Where is the cross tabulation for gender as reported in Line 67- 69. Was the finding statistically significant. Please clarify. Was there any analysis of continuous variables? Review Line 94 Lines 97 and 98. What was responsible for the decline in the number of <u>hospital admissions</u> for that year. Line 99 change are to were and review use of capital letters. Review Lines 123 and 124. Line 126; 40%. Line 135; southeast Nigeria. Review Line 157 -159 and Line 165 -169.. Polish the grammar of this manuscript. There is need was mentioned several times in the discussion.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ossai Edmund Ndudi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Community Medicine, Ebonyi State University, Nigeria</i>