



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_50720
Title of the Manuscript:	Understanding onchocerciasis perception and treatment experiences in a rural community in Cross River State, Nigeria: Implications for control Perception and awareness of onchocerciasis treatment in a rural community in Cross River State, Nigeria: implications for control Perception, awareness and treatment experiences about Onchocerciasis in a rural community in Cross River State, Nigeria: implications for control
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

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	There is need for the authors to make the necessary corrections and effect all the changes made on the Title, Abstract, and the body of the paper. Delete Table 4. Some state made in results that should come under discussion section.	(1)We agree in part to the re-phrasing of the article's title. Our study focused not only on perception and awareness but also on the treatment experiences of the respondents (2) We have taken on board most of the grammatical and lexical edits that were suggested. (3) We strongly believe that the qualitative methodology we applied enriched and gave robustness to our study findings. We want it retained in the article. (4)We have expunged the irrelevant statements in the results section
Minor REVISION comments	In two nstances where the x^2 statistical test was deemed to have been used were not properly stated for which data been compared.	This has been clarified in the text
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	