

Review of: "Expanding Participatory Epidemiology to Explore Community Perceptions of Human and Livestock Diseases among Pastoralists in Turkana County, Kenya"

Peter Oba¹

¹ Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper by Griffith et al. on expanding PE to explore community perception of human and livestock diseases among pastoralists in Turkana county Kenya is an interesting paper. The will contribute to in-depth understanding of community perceptions and importance of human and livestock diseases in a pastoralist setting. However, I have some comments / suggestions to make:

1. I suggest the authors should clearly distinguish between livestock only, zoonotic and human only diseases in the paper - to avoid confusing readers.
2. I appreciate the authors' efforts to clarify some conditions as syndromes/clinical signs, rather than as diseases e.g. diarrhea, urinary incontinence, edema, etc. In addition to diseases, also add the word syndromes before (Fig 3).
3. A distinction between diarrhea in livestock and diarrhea in humans needs to be separated in the graphs (Fig 3). The same with edema.
4. Parasitosis is a broad term that could mean many different things - ecto-parasites, endo-parasites and systemic parasites infections. This needs to be broken down/clarified what the respondents actually understood, so the meaning does not get distorted or misinterpreted by readers.
5. Plse correct the spelling of "Malaria" - in figure 3
6. I suggest authors could add a separate table to quantify mortality, morbidity rates, from the available data. This could enrich the results section.
7. On the statement "Participants also exhibited a deep understanding of epidemiology, such as disease structure (e.g., mortality rates across different age groups) and disease etiology" , I think this is a bit overrated. I did not see mortality rates in the paper, and that one cannot be sure of disease etiology from a pastoralist setting, unless confirmed by lab testing. The authors need to revise this statement.

Overall, the manuscript is well written and if authors agree to revise and consider the comments and suggestions raised, the manuscript is acceptable for publication.

Thank you,



Peter Oba,

Consultant Animal Health/ILRI

Kampala, Uganda