



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_41025
Title of the Manuscript:	USE OF INSECTICIDE-TREATED BEDNETS AMONG PEOPLE LIVING WITH HIV/AIDS ACCESSING CARE IN A TERTIARY HEALTH FACILITY IN SOUTHWEST, NIGERIA
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	Use of insecticide-treated bed nets among people living with HIV/AIDS .. The manuscript deals with a very important issue, but contains several errors in references and understanding of the subject. Line 41-42:"malaria in combination with HIV/AIDS are responsible for five million death annually", WHO 2013. However, this is not what the WHO reports says, it says the two together was estimated to have 5 million deaths; Since we are now in 2018, it would be better to use the most recent WHO report that says the two together caused app 2 million deaths Line 43: the number for malaria caused death is now below one million. Line 46: that number is also too high So, the author either state that this is about data from 2012 (who report 2013) or used more recent data. The link in reference 4 does not work. This link will lead to more recent data: http://www.who.int/malaria/areas/high_risk_groups/en/ Line 62: LLIN are much more effective than untreated nets than indicated. Intact untreated nets may be half as effective as insecticide treated nets, but when nets are used, they get holed. Holed, untreated nets loose their protection effect while this is not the case for insecticide treated nets. Since the information given is unprecise and not essential, just drop the words ""have been shown and". Finally, the use of the word ITN is unprecise. There has been no distribution of ITN that were not LLIN for many years, so the word LLIN should be explained and used instead. Line 73: in this chapter, it should be indicated when the data were collected and what period they cover. Line 104: the table is not easy to understand. How can the accumulated frequency be much higher than 100 %. I guess frequency really is numbers, if so, they should be recalculated as frequencies Line 106-to 111: the data collection does not reveal what people responded to. It seems that people have been asked if they used a bed net and it is known from hundreds of other studies, that people respond to that as if they EVER used a bednet. This is not a very useful information; more precise information can be obtained if they are asked if they used a bednet last night. Best data are observational, meaning the researcher visit the house to see if a net is hanging over the sleeping place. Line 131: therefore, this outstanding use rate is probably wildly overestimated, and the true use rate is unknown because the question raised (though not described) is probably not correct. The study in Uganda quoted is much better, but it is not correctly quoted(L Cohee et al, 2009). It describes that self-reported use rate"last night" was around 90 %, but for the households visited, 30 % did not have a bednet hanging and another 10-20 % had badly damaged nets. That brings this study in line with most other studies of use rate indicating a	Line 102 (formerly Line 104): The figures at the right-hand side of Table 2 are frequencies not percentages. If they were percentages they wouldn't be expected to be greater than 100, but being frequencies they are number of occurrences of the variable in question and therefore can be greater than 100. Line 152 (formerly Line 148): This study is a retrospective and not a directly observational one. The subjects were properly interviewed by trained personnel before enrolment into the free HAART scheme. And there's no justifiable reason to doubt the quality of the interview at enrolment, we therefore do not agree with this Reviewer's opinion that the conclusion in Line 152-153 is doubtful



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

	use rate around 60 % in the rainy/high nuisance seasons and much lower, between 10 and 45 % depending on how close the researchers got to study what people actually did instead of asking. If the Uganda study is general, it brings the use rate of HIV patients in line with other people! Line 148, since the data are of doubtful quality, the conclusion is also doubtful	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		