

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

Sitraka Rakotosamimanana

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper evaluates the perceptions of pastoralist communities in Kenya regarding livestock diseases, using a participatory epidemiology approach. Overall, the article provides information from the community's perspective on zoonotic diseases affecting livestock. And participatory epidemiology is adapted to address the issue of community perception of disease.

Abstract

Abstract too long. Can you reduce the abstract length by summarizing the study objectives, for example.

One health impact statement.

Focuses on participatory approaches in epidemiology. In my opinion, it would be better to include this statement in the methodology section.

Introduction

Too long. Reducing the introduction a little would enable the reader to position himself in relation to the theme I think the paragraphs should be rearranged:

Start with the advantages of participatory epidemiology in researching community perceptions of disease.

In a global vision, worldwide to start with, then move on to specific contexts, in sub-Saharan Africa and/or Kenya for example, if this approach has already been used for other one health themes.

Then talk about pastoralism in Kenya , and end with the objectives of the study.

Methods

I don't understand why the paragraph on devolution in 2010 is important in the text in the methods section.

In the methods for conducting Focus Groups, I don't understand why you mixed men and women? Is there any particular reason why this could be a bias in relation to the results of the study?

No mention of ethics in the methods section. How was participant information protected? Has the confidentiality of study

participants' information been guaranteed?

Did you go through an ethics committee to carry out the study?

With regard to the method used, in particular the proportional pilling exercise, even if the aim is to obtain a relative perception, it would be interesting to carry out bivariate statistical analyses to determine whether place of residence and the answers obtained during the interviews were significantly associated or not. To see whether responses vary statistically according to place of residence.

Results

The results are not detailed.

Could we have the socio-demographic profile of the participants in each focus group? Did the focus groups have similar characteristics in the three locations studied?

A table with these characteristics would have done the trick.

I note that semi-quantitative data were nevertheless collected.

At no point are the results of the proportional pilling exercise mentioned in the text of the results, nor are any values/proportions mentioned, whereas this information is present in the table. Could you provide more interpretation and information on the content of Table 3 (with the proportions obtained)?

General comment:

The article should be more organized and shorter, especially in the introductory section.

Information is lacking in the method section. Basic statistical analyses can provide information that could meet the objectives of the study.

The results obtained do not reflect the methods and materials used.

When the additional results have been added, the discussions could be more interesting and will provide more debate in relation to the theme raised.