



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.	



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.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> 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?	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kehinde Kazeem Kanmodi
Department, University & Country	Nigeria