

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Dengue Fever Responses in Dhaka City, Bangladesh: A Cross-sectional Survey

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Jean Tenena Coulibaly

Submitted on: 25 Jul 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604809

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

- The overlap of COVID-19 and DF symptoms may lead to an underestimation of the number of DF cases, especially in the context of a COVID-19 pandemic.
- The number of FD cases is statistically related to gender (more in male than female), age, accommodation, education and occupation.
- FD control measures should be defined in a participatory manner with strong community involvement

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

One of the major limitations of this study is the online questionnaire. This approach introduces a potential selection bias into the study, excluding automatically vulnerable and often illiterate populations who do not have access to these platforms. This may mask a wrong epidemiological reality.

The sample required by the study was not clearly defined

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

Minor comment

= Please revised all the tables considering the guidelines of the journal

Major comment

Abstract

= "1008 individuals participated in a pre-tested KAP survey" this sentence should belong to the results section. In methods, you should describe the tool use to assess the response of DF

= "More than 20% reported DF before" Before what?

= "65% of residents had good knowledge" On what?

= "Female residents demonstrated better DF attitudes and practices compared to the male." How this has been assessed statistically? Please, provide statistics here (chi-square and p-value at least)

= Does this come from the current study or is an assumption!?

Conceptual framework

= I will advise that this part be remove from the MS since, not providing new information for the readers.

Methods

Research design and ethical issue

= "During the COVID-19 pandemic, an online cross-sectional survey gathered self-reported data. The boundary criteria were Dhaka city residents and internet access." Regarding the subject of this MS, it is difficult

to cash the rational behind these sentences. Please, revise. You could simply write, "The current study is an online cross-sectional survey"

= write "Questionnaire" instead of "Survey instruments" since it seems that only a questionnaire was used

= L103 "the acceptable value" or "the accepted value" ???

Data collection and analysis

= "In August 2019, Dhaka city recorded the highest dengue cases (1). The COVID-19 pandemic also became apparent at this period in 2020 (27)." This is beyond the methods. Please revise accordingly

= Describe better how the sample size has been assessed

= L108-L110 "384 respondents were required... Thus, the response rate was 91.64%." This par belong to the results. Please remove it from here

= What do you mean by "also demonstrated to determine". Please revise the synthaxe

Results

= "Due to the online pattern, most of the respondents reported tertiary-level education (91%) and were also students (65%)." This is already the discussion

Discussion

= "We also found that the elder group was more infected in comparison with the younger group. » Beside the reasons raise here the authors could relate this observation related to that elders are more cumulative number of DF episodes than younger ones

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 → Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

YES

Q 5 → Are the keywords appropriate?

"general people" and "developing settlement" are not appropriate as key words in the current work. For the first, the authors highlighted them-self that the online approach was excluding illiterate people. For the second, nowhere in the methods and all MS particular attention is given to developing settlement

Q 6 → Is the English language of sufficient quality?

YES

Q 7 → Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

No.

Q 8 → Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

YES

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 → Originality



Q 10 Rigor

Q 11 Significance to the field

Q 12 Interest to a general audience

Q 13 Quality of the writing

Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Major revisions.