

# Review of: "Prevalence of Buruli Ulcer Among Residents in Jasikan Municipality: A Cross-Sectional Study"

Godsway Edem Kpene<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Health and Allied Sciences

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Article title: Prevalence of Buruli Ulcer Among Residents in Jasikan Municipality: A Cross-Sectional Study

I am truly honored to serve as a reviewer for this article. The study offers valuable insights into the cases of Buruli ulcer in the Jasikan Municipality, which will undoubtedly serve as a valuable resource for guiding future interventions. To enhance the quality of the article for the authors' consideration, I have provided the following comments:

### Abstract:

- The abstract is succinct and study aim clearly stated.
- **Method:**
  - I find it difficult to reconcile the sampling technique employed for the study. The abstract mentions simple random sampling technique, but the main article has census approach as the sampling technique. Authors should kindly consider clarifying, as the two sampling techniques are totally different.
  - Authors should consider removing "A sample of" in the sentence "A sample of 56 cases of Buruli ulcer was identified from the population"
  - To the best of my knowledge, no inferential statistics was carried out in this article, hence, authors should consider removing the statement "at a significance level of  $p < 0.05$ ".
- The conclusion should rather read, "**The prevalence of** Buruli ulcer was found to be high among the population".

### Main work:

#### Methods

- **Sample size determination:** since census approach, which involves collecting data from every single individual or element in the entire population was used; there may not be a need for determining a sample size in this case.
- Authors should consider adding a section on case definition. Perhaps the laminated pictures of the various stages of Buruli ulcer could be added here for reader information.
- **Data collection and procedure:**
  - Authors stated that "Once a case was identified, it was matched with a control in the same community", it is hard to understand why this was done in the context that the current study has a cross sectional design and not a case control

study. Authors should consider revising.

- Authors should consider mentioning the data captured by the questionnaire in the methods section. For instance, The semi-structured questionnaire was used to collect data on sociodemographic characteristics such as age, sex ...

- **Statistical Analysis:**

- The versions of Epi Data and STATA used are different from what is stated in the abstract. Authors should consider revising.
- The statement “Statistical significance was considered at a level of 5%” should be taken out as no inferential statistics was done.
- Authors should consider providing the 95% Confidence Intervals of all proportions calculated in the tables.

**Results:**

- Correct the sentence “The study sampled 56 participants...” to “The study found 56 Buruli ulcer cases in the study population”.
- Table 2 should rather be “clinical characterization of Buruli ulcer among cases ...”
- “0.000764 per 10,000 population” should rather be 7.64 per 10,000 population.

**Discussion:**

- Authors should consider enhancing the overall strength of their arguments, addressing not only the relevance of their study within the Ghanaian setting but also the implications of their findings for the specific study jurisdiction.

I look forward to reading the revised version of this article when these concerns are duly addressed.