



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_35559
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF TRAINING ON ACUTE FLACCID PARALYSIS SURVEILLANCE AMONG SURVEILLANCE OFFICERS IN ONDO STATE
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	The paper presents an Original Research Article about the assessment of training among surveillance officers. The subject is relevant to the health research, although the study needs to be revised for better contribution in the area. That said, I recommend the authors to do a minor review, checking some points that are described below.	
Minor REVISION comments	Overall, the article is well written and organized, however the ideas are confusing in some parts. The text has many abbreviations and many of them have not been explained before (previously identified). The numbering of the sections is not uniform and the titles of the sections and of the tables also are not uniform (sometimes authors refer to the participants as respondents and in others moments as participants). Abstract: The purpose of the study is not well delineated. I suggest rewriting and putting the verbs in the infinitive. 1.Introduction Line 43: The phrase has the words "in the country" repeated. Correct Line 49: Include a period (end point). Line 64: OPV: was the abbreviation previously identified? Line 73: the abbreviation LGA appears in the text and its identification appears only below in line 77. Line 76: IDSR: Was the abbreviation previously identified? 2.Materias and Methods Line 100 and 101: What is LGA PHC? Better explain the material used to evaluate the training. Was it a questionnaire? Was the same one elaborated by the authors? I suggest including it in the text. 3.Results This topic should be numbered without the zero to maintain compliance in the text (3.0 to 3.). Table 1: At the end of the table, include the abbreviations and their meanings, such as CHW:, MRO: ... I suggest that the author include a line with "NONE" in the item "Year last trained on AFP surveillance" so that the n remains n = 54 because, in this way, the percentage will be referring to the total sample of participants, facilitating the interpretation of the results. Table 2: I suggest including the "mean score" of the pre and post tests and include the abbreviations with the meanings at the end of the table. Figure 1: Correct "EVEALUATION" to "EVALUATION". 4.Discussion	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 169: The phrase is repetitive. The assessment of training is often repeated. And the authors should rethink: What is more important? Do the training or evaluate the training? Or both? Make that idea clearer. Line 179: Authors report "we observed that a high proportion of the participants were in the older age group" but they do not discuss this outcome. What does that mean? The first paragraph of the discussion is important because it justifies the importance of the study. A similar phrase must be at the end of the introduction precisely because of this. Line 191: Better explain the reference article [12]: what was the sample? Line 198: The idea is not clear. Improve the sentence.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Mariana Ribeiro Volpini Lana</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>FAE, Bioengineering Department, FUMEC University, Brazil</i>