

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

James Prah¹

¹ University of Cape Coast

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

sampling technique and sample size determination: the sampling technique used in this study is confusing. In the abstract it is stated that a simple random technique was used. It is practically impossible to use this technique without a sampling frame which cannot be obtained in such a huge population. You also stated elsewhere that you used the census technique. In this technique all eligible participants are recruited and therefore no sample size is calculated since the number of participants only depends on the number eligible.

Did you therefore involved the 56 participants because of the calculated sample size or it was because that is the number you found on the field? The calculation of a sample size is therefore not necessary if you actually used the census method.

You also stated that every case was matched with a control. Why did you select controls? What is your definition of a 'control' in this study? This should be clearly stated in the inclusion/exclusion criteria. There was no mention of these controls any where else in the manuscript.

You stated that 41% of your participants reported that their condition has been confirmed. Did you verify from the health facilities they visited that if indeed investigations were conducted to confirm that their lesions are due to buruli ulcer?.

Prevalence calculation: Since the 56 cases found are not confirmed and could be due to other conditions, you should report your findings as "prevalence of suspected cases of buruli ulcer".

Statistical analysis: you stated that Statistical significance was considered at a level of 5%. What test of significance and associations did you perform in this study?

Recommendation: ACCEPT AFTER REVISIONS TO MANUSCRIPT