



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_47973
Title of the Manuscript:	AGE RELATED PATTERN OF AWARENESS AND BASIC KNOWLEDGE ON ZIKA VIRUS DISEASE AMONG WOMEN VISITING CHILDREN IMMUNIZATION UNIT IN ENUGU STATE UNIVERSITY TEACHING HOSPITAL, SOUTHEAST NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Title need to rewrite.</li> <li>- A selection criterion is totally wrong because participants were care givers and age ranges from 19 to 70 years. Women at the age of 60 or 19 year may not be interested in Zika virus and maternal outcomes. However; pregnant mother or potential mother is much interested in safe pregnancy outcome and for that her knowledge is most essential.</li> <li>- Participants were from Nursing sciences may already conscious about disease</li> <li>- It is hospital based, so no homogeneity maintained and results could not be generalized.</li> <li>- Only age related pattern reported that does not provide the depth of study</li> <li>- 7% reported hospital as source of information it indicate hospitals are not in position to provide wide knowledge on Zika virus or age of study subjects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Title is certainly appropriate for the objective of the study. Reviewer however did not suggest any title.</li> <li>- Selection criteria is very correct since the study was deliberately focused on care givers. Though pregnant women are most affected by Zika virus infection, the disease could also affect others including adult males leading to neurological complication such as Guillain Barre syndrome. Zika virus studies certainly should not be limited to pregnant women and potential mothers.</li> <li>- Participants were not from Nursing Sciences. They were persons from the general public, that brought their children to the hospital for immunization. Most of them were Civil servants (48.4%), while only 1 person out of 256 (0.4%) was a nurse.</li> <li>- Hospital based studies are not prohibited. Non-homogeneity of the respondents, and the number in each age group was reported as a LIMITATION to this study. That is the standard practice. Discussions and comparisms were predominantly focused on 20 to 49 years age groups, which are within the child-bearing age range. These were clearly stated in the text.</li> <li>- Since the title and the objective was to look at the AGE RELATED PATTERN; expanding the depth to include education, occupation, etc would have been outside the scope and very lengthy.</li> <li>- 7% of the respondents getting Zika virus information from the hospital is a key finding that justified increasing Zika virus health awareness talk in the hospitals. Such findings justify research projects.</li> </ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Introduction</b> : missing in gap of knowledge and address the future implications</p> <p><b>Key words</b> : please revise</p> <p><b>Methodology</b> : selection of subjects were not based on scientific ground</p> <p><b>Discussion</b>: very less information ( only 2 references) and repetitions from results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I am of the opinion that the introduction is adequate. Introductions are usually not meant to be a comprehensive literature review, and compendium of every information about the subject matter.</li> <li>- No suggestions as to the key words to be used.</li> <li>- Selection of the subjects were based on Scientific method (Random Sampling method). This was stated in the text.</li> <li>- Discussions depends on the subject matter. Subjects that have not been extensively researched upon might be discussed without out references. I believe the important thing is for the researcher to make sense out of the research findings. Results were only mentioned to buttress some points.</li> </ul>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Topic is very good but methodology and discussion need to revise and rewrite as per the need of local, national point of view. The depth of knowledge is very poor.	Explanations above probably justify the methodology , discussion and depth as currently written.

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	