



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_38252
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of bacterial meningitis surveillance data, 2011-2015, East Mamprusi District, Ghana.
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	An informative study. But I need to clarify few more things: Since this is being a study based on secondarily data the validity is questionable. But I know this cannot be done now... 1. Describe the method of diagnosis of meningitis. 2. Case definition of bacterial meningitis... 3. Methods of detecting etiological agents 4. Details on etiological agents need to be included and analysed... (prevalence / incidence/ DALY and CFR separately) Also, overall etiology/ total cases. 5. How many viral/ parasitic/ fungal cases.... Without proper etiology...??? 6. Age distribution 1-15 is wide. Better re-classify as 1-5 and 5-15 like. 7. Data flow need to clarify as – from the diagnosis to notification (how this data comes/ credibility need to confirmed...) 8. Methods of calculations of rates and ratios need to included in methods with references. 9. I think is better to calculate DALY 10. Tables- to include a validity – include p values and comments (analysis ...) 11. Discussion- need to amended according to methods and results.. 12. Recent for high CFR need to be discussed. 13. What actions were taken to prevent as well as control the cases... and emergence of meningitis in addition to vaccination.	1. The method of diagnosis has been addressed in the introduction 2. The case definition has included in the introduction. 3. Methods of detecting etiological agents has been added to the introduction. 4. The details on the etiological agents is not available from the secondary data used for the study for analyses. 5. No viral/parasitic/fungal cases were recorded over the period. This will be stated in the results section. 6. The age distribution 1-15 is the scale that was used for the data collection of meningitis cases. Since the study is based on secondary data I have no control over the age distribution used. 7. Data flow from diagnosis to notification has been included in the introduction. 8. Methods of calculations of rates and ratios has been included in the methods with reference. 9. The secondary data available for the study unfortunately does not provide the variables and measurements required to calculate DALY, hence it is not an objective for the study. 10. The data used for the study is secondary data, the use of p values cannot be applied in this case. 11. Discussion has been amended according to methods and results. 12. Reason for high CFR has been discussed from line 264-268 13. The actions taken to prevent and control cases include case isolation and management and contacts tracing as have been stated in the last paragraph of the discussion.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		