



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_46361
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiological and Clinical profiles of Melioidosis in tertiary care centre in Northern Sri Lanka.
Type of the Article	Case study

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>)

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	Finding E. coli isolates in toilets cannot be considered as a major issue of scientific importance until the large percentage of ESBL-producing strains is not isolated. This finding is of major importance in spite of the fact that the number of samples is relatively small to establish percentages. It should be more correct to put the exact number of the referred findings and estimate the percentage in brackets (it was done only in few instances). The articles cited in the paper (Erb et al, 20), included 639 toilets in their study and described the sanitation level of those toilets as of being only 4,5% equipped with hand washing facilities, which was not done in the manuscript, and it might rise the suspicion that actually very few toilets were included in the study.	
Minor REVISION comments	Describe the condition and the number of toilets included in the study. The findings should be clearly mentioned in actual numbers and percentages as well.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gabor Ternak
Department, University & Country	University of Péce, Hungary