

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Knowledge, Attitude and Practices towards Dengue Fever among Slum Dwellers: A Case Study in Dhaka City, Bangladesh

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Jean Tenena Coulibaly

Submitted on: 25 Apr 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605364

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The authors of the current manuscript were assessing knowledge, attitude and practices towards Dengue Fever among Slum Dwellers in the frame of a case study in Dhaka City in Bangladesh. They found that moderate knowledge of the lethal effects, common symptoms, the contagious nature of DF and the identification of female Aedes mosquito involved in the the dengue virus transmission. However, the respondents were less aware of the rule of asymptomatic in the transmission and the transmission of the virus to a fetus and the probable breeding places.

They were trying to related all these issues to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

- The authors were trying to related the current study to the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the current study design could not assess this. The authors could trust to focus on the data derived from the current cross sectional design.

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.

Abstract

= The abstract structure and content should be deeply revise

= L7: "The regression models were applied when applicable" Which regression models?

= It seems that is a pre-tested questionnaire, which was used for the face-to-face interview? If yes. Please specify that in the "Methods"

= Where are the key findings related to Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices regarding DF? Please, summarize your key findings in the abstract.

= Please add "KAP" to key words since that is the focus of your work.

= The conclusion should be the key message derived from your key findings including recommendation and not a general statement, which could be said without any investigation.

Methods

= L66: Write "Study design and population" instead of "Research design and study population

= L81-L83: "Malibagh Slum Motijheel Slum.". A map showing the 12 slums could be helpful avoiding this long list.

= L104 : Please, remove Sample size calculation from "Data Collection and Analysis" and generate a new section focus on that.

= L104 : "Data Collection and Analysis" It seems that this part is talking about sample size calculation and data analysis?! If so, please write "Data analysis" instead of "Data Collection and Analysis" by considering my previous comment on sample size calculation.

= The way the 18 respondents per slum have been selected should be clarified to help readers

Results

= L170–L174: “Regarding attitude, marital status, level of education,significant determinants of practices against DF”. This is a repetition of what has been already stated at L165–L169

Discussion

L184–L185: Please remove this “The findings of the KAP study on DF among Dhaka city slum dwellers are presented in this study.”

= Conclusion is too broad, please, focus on your key findings and avoid speculations.

References

= For references citation please keep considering the journal guideline for references citation. I am not sure if this “[cited 2020 Dec 19];1-15. Available from:

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10911359.2020.1848688>” is something acceptable at the end of each reference.

PLEASE COMMENT

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

Yes

Q 5 → Are the keywords appropriate?

In the Key words authors should add "KAP"

Q 6 → Is the English language of sufficient quality?

YES

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

Yes.

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.