



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_44257
Title of the Manuscript:	The behavior of Jhum cultivators living in Chattogram Hill Tracts districts and its relation with malaria in Bangladesh
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors of this manuscript had conducted a research work on interesting areas of public health importance. Kudos to them..... However, I have some constructive comments to make as regards this piece of work: 1. There are so many English errors in this paper. The title of the paper need to be revised for linguistic errors. The abstract, down to the conclusion need to be revised for English errors. THIS PAPER NEEDS A THOROUGH LINGUSTIC EDITING. 2. In the world of Science, generic name is started with capital letter (e.g Plasmodium) and not with a small letter (e.g. plasmodium). This need to be corrected in the paper. 3. Unstandardized abbreviations, when used for the first time, MUST be written in full at its first use. In this paper, authors wrote some abbreviations (e.g. LLIN, BRAC...) with no full meaning reflecting at its first or subsequent use. What are their meanings? 4. Authors should use "Methods" or "Material and methods" preferable instead of the one in the abstract section. 5. The flow chart illustrating the sampling technique adopted in this study is not consistent with that described in the text. This need clarification. The methodology section needs to be SELF-EXPLANATORY.....it MUST NOT BE AMBIGUOUS. 6. In the text, you do not need to be stating "qualitative study like focus group discussion...." This is a scientific material; you need to go straight to the point. In strongly suggest you write.. "Focus group discussion was....." 7. Anytime you write the full meaning of an abbreviation, you need to put the abbreviation in parenthesis immediately at its first use. Please do that for "FGD" and others, if any. 8. I am not a statistician, I strongly recommend that this journal to also give a statistician this manuscript for statistical review. My comments may not dwell so much on the statistics. 9. The methodology of the focus group discussion is very poor. Nothing was made mention by the authors on how information was obtained, how the information were transcribed and analysed in themes..... The methodology of the qualitative section is very poor. 10. The results of the qualitative part of the study are not well elucidated unlike the quantitative part. No quotation was made.....This needs to be done and each relevant quotations to be put in the text need to be accompanied by the demographic attribute of the informant (e.g. age, gender, and tribe). 11. The ethical issues need to be properly addressed. Can the authors provide information on the anonymity, confidentiality, beneficent, and non-maleficent issues associated with their kind of study. 12. The discussion is too wordy and confusing.... I suggest that authors compress this section appropriately and make it more meaningful and interesting to read. The discussion section has too many English errors and it needs to re-presented more logically, concisely, correctly, systematically, and completely. 13. THE ETHICAL ISSUES SURROUNDING THIS PAPER NEED TO BE CLEARED IN THE MANUSCRIPT.	1. We agreed with the reviewer comments and have revised the manuscript with thorough linguistic editing. 2. Thank you the reviewer. We edited the manuscript according to the comment. 3. Done. However BRAC is brand of organization, previously it's meaning "Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee". 4. In fact, we mentioned methods section as per Journal requirement. 5. Thank you for reviewer comment. We have redesigned and clarified methodology for more understandable to reader and reviewer. The formula used for sampling was : $p(1-p)(z^2)/e^2$; where p is the probability of success and 1-p is the probability of not happening, z is the confidence interval and e is the margin of error. We found total sample size was 480 with addition of 25% non-response rate. We got this data from 16 households of each 30 para through cluster random sampling where the 30 para were selected randomly from 10 sub-districts following BBS sampling frame. The 10 sub-districts were eventually selected from two CHT districts—Rangamati and Bandarban. However, we have deleted the flow chart in revised manuscript. . We have been added following sentence mostly in 3rd paragraph in material section for reader and reviewer understanding in revised manuscript (<i>italic format</i>). <i>A fixed questionnaire had been used by trained enumerators to collect data from household. If a tribal community was different from the tribe of enumerator then local educated tribal people was appointed for translating the questionnaire. At first, a Jhum cultivator was selected from household for required answer. If a household had no Jhum cultivator then other occupation such as forest goer, cultivator or daily labourer had been chosen. If any participant agreed to have malaria disease in last one year then it was crosschecked with Rapid Diagnostic Testing (RDT) or laboratory register.</i> 6. Thank you and done 7. Thank you and done 8. I think the result we have produced are statistically ok and we have reviewed all the data in line with reviewer concern. 9. We agreed with reviewer's comment. We have redesigned the methodology of qualitative study as per reviewer's suggestion. We have been added following sentence in 2nd paragraph in page no. 6 in material section-- P06 L06-09 (Line 06-09 in page 06) for reader and reviewer understanding in revised manuscript (<i>italic format</i>). <i>Around 5-7 members of a para with 50% of Jhum cultivators were participated in the discussion. Both male and female were included in FGD. If a para was</i>



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<i>inhabited with mixed tribe, then the tribal people with high population were taken for discussion. Two persons were working for one FGD, one as Moderator and other one as Reporter</i> <i>In 2nd paragraph in page no. 7</i> <i>Data was transcribed in Bengali language and then it was finalized after completing the discussion. Both enumerators should agree in each point of discussion. When necessary the transcripts were supplemented by field noted to clarify the issues. English transcripts were made to develop codes that identify important and common concepts related to main theme of the study. Data analysis was done based on the thematic approach that involved organizing from the collected information into meaningful category.</i> <i>10. We agreed to the reviewer's comment. We have been added few quotations according to thematic approach in table 7 of page 14:</i> <i>"Many times we have to stay at Jhum sites and sometimes we haven't. It depends on distance."</i> <i>"Many person like to stay at Jhum sites as it secure the crop."</i> <i>'We should take LLIN if it available. We could not sleep without net at Jhum site. But most of time it do not cover the whole family.'</i> <i>"Yes, we should hang net at Jhum site. But most of them do not use LLIN."</i> <i>"Sometime we do not remember to bring LLIN. But we use net for sleeping at night at Jhum site."</i> <i>"We hang LLIN with temporary bamboo sheet at sleeping time. "</i> <i>'If we bring LLIN, then tied with pole of four corner and sometimes hang it with rope. "</i> <i>"It is difficult to hang LLIN at Jhum site. But we should do it because there is mosquitoes singing all the night.'</i> <i>11. We think we described the ethical issue in page 19 where we stated that there is no testing of RDT or microscopy by our enumerators, which we deemed not consider for ethical approval for this study. However, we added few sentence according to reviewer's comment in P19 (Line 16-19 in page 19) in revised manuscript (italic format).</i> <i>Willingness and independency of participants was utmost important which we follow throughout the study and all papers are kept in safe custody as confidential. Anonymity of participants were strictly followed in qualitative study where opinion of participants only recorded with their due consensus.</i> <i>12. We agreed with reviewer's comment and have been shorten the discussion section which is logical to result section. We have deleted 12– 20 line of page no. 15 (P15 L12-20) and 7- 8 line of page 18 (P 18 L 7-8) of original manuscript and We restructured the paragraph in following way in revised manuscript (italic format).</i> <i>Jhum cultivation, the mix crop cultivation which is dominated by male member has more exposure to malaria than female. In this study, male (32.46%) were more affected with malaria than female (18.51%) (OR = 2.11, P-value = 0.002) [3].</i> <i>It is a fact that the abundance of mosquitoes at Jhum sites leads to higher rates of infection among Jhum cultivators. Topologically, the CHT districts vary from other regions of the country being typical of ranges of forested hills and associated valleys with rivers and small lakes [20] that provide abundant oviposition sites for potential vector species.</i> <i>13. We think this is responded as of 11</i>
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The methodology of the study is very poor. This paper needs serious linguistic editing.	BRAC is working with National Elimination Programme under DGHS of Bangladesh since 2007 as a Principal Recipient (PR) under the funding from Global Fund. We have been implementing the project under joint collaboration of NMEP following the protocol approved by Bangladesh. As there is no need of ethical approval as per Journal point of view, we did not go for approval. However, we ensured other aspects of confidentiality and independence as per research point of view. Thank you the reviewer for in-depth comment.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u> YES. Authors need to address issues on confidentiality, independence of participants, etc. Because this study is not an invasive study does not necessarily exclude the study from not undergoing ethical review and clearance before embarking on the study. Authors should state where they got permission for the study... Was it their research department, local government office, anyone?	