

# Review of: "Knowledge, Practices and Attitude of Residents towards Buruli Ulcer in Jasikan Municipality: An Ethnographic Study"

Benjamin P. Niriwa<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Ghana

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

REVIEWER'S COMMENTS ON "KNOWLEDGE, PRACTICES AND ATTITUDE OF RESIDENTS TOWARDS BURULI ULCER IN JASIKAN MUNICIPALITY: AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY."

IMPRESSIONS: The authors have done an excellent work carrying out their project on one of the neglected diseases. Their project is, emphatically, very relevant as it follows current trends of infectious diseases. Buruli ulcer is obviously a disease that comes with discrimination, stigma and false perceptions. This makes it a serious societal problem but not just a disease perse. Their project obviously would add to knowledge building and I like the fact that they targeted health education with their findings.

Reading through I could determine that the authors have demonstrated to be knowledgeable in what they did. Anyone reading through their work, who previously did not know what Buruli ulcer is, would be able to describe it after that. The description for the disease is properly done! The discussion was also properly done according to the standard for doing research.

Their organization of chapters were also okay with good grammatical expressions, in general. Their results, discussions, conclusion and recommendations were all properly done.

CRITICISMS: However; for an important project like this, criticisms by reviewers are the surest ways of modifying it to meet international standard.

My first problem is how the background is written! A lot could have gone into the background but were excluded. Since they are presenting their project's findings in the form of research article and the literature review was not specifically included, readers would have appreciated how Buruli ulcer is transmitted if its mode of transmission were included as a sub-heading under the background. They could have also added how it can be prevented, for which they cannot forget about laboratory diagnosis and the environment. The diagnosis in particular is very important as far as this important project is concerned!

The authors have not properly explained how they were able to diagnose those participants that were included in the study as Buruli ulcer patients. If their diagnosis is not clear, it is difficult to understand how they were able to categorized others as Buruli ulcer patients. There is nowhere that they made mentioned of medical laboratory diagnosis or clearly explained how they selected those who are Buruli ulcer patients. Though laboratory investigation was not done, their ability to explain clearly how they categorized those as Buruli ulcer patients and controls is important.

Aside their main objective or purpose, it is difficult to identify which specific objectives the authors used to help them

answer the main one. Even the main objective was not part of the background. It is seen under different headings: “Abstract” and “Data collection”. All these are very important information that should have been easily detected in the background.

Under the methodology too, the study setting was not clearly written. The sample size is indicated twenty (20). But the demographic data of the results are indicating forty (40) participants, for which 20 of them were “Cases” and the other 20 were “Controls”. This is realized when the variables of each of the demographic data are added. Example, when the various age categories are summed up; they gave 20 each for the cases and controls.

Though the discussion is excellent, three typographic errors were detected. The authors discussed their findings using the past tense predominantly. This is supposed to be consistent throughout. Unfortunately, the third (3rd) word of the first sentence of the first paragraph is in present continuous. The same error is repeated in the fourth (4th) word of the first sentence, and third (3rd) word of the third sentence both in the third paragraph.

For the abbreviations, about four (4) of them were counted but only one (GHS) which was not even seen in the work was listed under the abbreviations.

For the references, WHO is rightly cited in the work in abbreviated form; but in the out text, the full “World Health Organization” is cited; this is good! However, it makes searching for it to confirm difficult.

#### SUGGESTIONS:

**Background:** The authors should add the mode of transmission of the disease, its prevention with more emphasis on the environment, diagnosis and treatment. Since they want the project to be used as a tool for health education, these would help provide more information to guide people who would be using it for that intention. They should also make their objectives clear in the background, both the main and specific objectives. These are normally stated at the background of every research or project.

**Methodology:** Authors should bring both the Map of Ghana and that of Jasikan Municipality under the study settings. This will make the location of the study site clearer and easy to locate.

**Results:** The differences in the sample sizes detected in the results and the methodology should be clarified. If there is any reason for the differences it should be clear.

**Discussions:** Authors should go through the work to edit those three typographic errors detected.

**Abbreviations:** All abbreviations used in the work should be listed with their full meanings under the “Abbreviations”.

**References:** For the reference that was abbreviated, the authors should have started the out-text citation with the same abbreviated form, then follow it by the full meaning.

This is an excellent project! I hope these suggestions would help modify it to meet international standard. Thank you!

