

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

Patrick Martial Nkamedjie Pete

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

General comments:

Good attempt by the authors to fill knowledge gap regarding Buruli ulcer

1. With regard to the data presented, the research paper seems to be a cross-sectional descriptive study on "suspected" Buruli ulcer patients.
2. Referencing should be reviewed both in the introduction and discussion.
3. The size determination and sampling do not allow inference to determine prevalence. The study design cannot help calculate prevalence.
4. Proofreading and editing are required.

Introduction:

1. Mode of transmission of Buruli is unknown, but the authors mentioned "These were among residents who lived near the Oda and Offin rivers". This suggests that the people could have contracted the disease from the rivers at the time". This is confusing. The last sentence should be removed.
2. Were the cases reported in the Volta region counted among the overall number of cases identified in Ghana in 2015, 2016, and 2017? Also not sure about the added value of mentioning cases reported in the Volta region.
3. There appears to be no clear data on the prevalence of Buruli ulcer in the Jasikan Municipality. Were the cases mentioned detected at a health facility, or is there active surveillance, including community-based surveillance?

Method

1. Sex ratio of 91:9 is confusing, and this data is not very useful.
2. What do you mean by age dependency? This has to be reformulated.
3. How many health centers are found in the catchment area?
4. What is the total population of the study site?
5. Add data on the health care provider vs. inhabitant ratio.
6. Keep only useful data on the study site.
7. Nodules, plaques, and lesions could be other pathologies and not necessarily Buruli ulcer.
8. Were the (suspected) Buruli cases confirmed in the lab? What was the differential diagnosis?
9. Why were residents with wounds who were seriously ill and required medical care excluded? Elaborate a little more on

the criteria for selecting respondents and the reasons.

10. Sample size determination and sampling method are a little confusing. Do you mean case search was done to interview 56 respondents?
11. Include the reference formula for sample size determination.
12. Clarify if the questionnaire was administered at the household level.
13. "Once a case was identified, it was matched with a control in the same community." This sentence creates confusion as the study appears to be cross-sectional and not case-control.
14. Statistical analysis: what type of statistical variables did you calculate; mean, percentages, SD, ... etc.?

Results.

1. Seems we have participants who were less than 18 years. Was the consent of a parent or tutor sought? Explain this in the methodology.
2. What is the meaning of JHS and SHS? Include the full meaning in the table.
3. Table titles should be written at the top of the table and not at the bottom.

Discussion:

1. Elaborate more, comparing findings with those of other research papers. Discuss the impact of the key findings on case management and the overall health system.

Conclusion:

1. Recommendations found in the abstract should go to the broader health care providers, including those at the health facilities. These recommendations also need to be well detailed after the discussion. They could be added in the conclusion section of the article.