

Review of: "Sociodemographic Determinants of Gender Disparity in Dengue Fever Diagnosis and Treatment"

Adekunl Megbuwawon¹

¹ Babcock University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review summary Sociodemographic Determinant of Gender Disparity in Dengue fever Diagnosis and Treatment A Retrospective cohort study that was solely conducted with data from Addis Ababa Med school. The Data set of 1498 Dengue fever patients were gathered. A total of 783 Males and 715 Females. The factors considered in the Sociodemography included Age, Education, Household income, Occupation, Residence and Relationship with healthcare outcome. The Outcome of the study were equitable health service to M&F. There were no significant gender difference. There were however more males in rural area than females. The author pointed out key factors that limited the study such as been a Retrospective study as well as the use of a Single centre. **Abstract** The abstract though tried to be detailed but lack information on previous findings of other researches around the subject matter. Findings stated were vague and not strong. The Referencing style were not consistent. Researcher should acquaint himself with the journal referencing style and update. **Introduction** Background to the study is rather short. No demographic distribution of the disease was stated. What were the other studies done on this disease and how does their finding address the topic. How is the topic addressing a gap in the dengue fever discussion. Are there references that show series of this topic as a gap in previous topics. The objective of the study is not clearly stated, how does the independent variable influence the outcome of the dependent variable. **Method** The study methodology has not followed conventional pattern or justified the reason for the study location and population. Why did you choose a sole institution, was it for convenience?. How did you arrive at choosing a particular study site, How did you arising from the study site. What are the specific demographics of the study population, how were you able to get the informed consent of the patient. At another section, the writer claimed getting informed consent was a limitation, which is which. Did you visit their houses, are they all still alive. How did you get the healthcare seeking. Are you discussing healthcare seeking behaviour or health seeking behaviour or health services seeking behaviour. How did you obtain the data of health seeking behaviour as a demographic data of the client as stated in the writeup. It's more appropriate to have stated the data software used for the analysis rather than a sophisticated data analysis software. What data software or package was used. The measurement criteria for the outcome variables were not clear in terms of what specifically were measured to give the conclusion. Acknowledgment of the study limitation was well stated and the limits show the validity for the study. There was however inconsistency in terminology of the variable such as healthcare seeking and health seeking behavior. Inconsistency in wording, at a point the researcher said informed consent was obtained from patient, at another he cited informed consent as a limitation to the study. **Discussion** The author in his discussion did not elaborate. What significant findings in the literature reviewed suggest if other factors had been worked on and what the outcome and limitations were. This would reduce the limitation and provide more robust

findingsThe author provided more insight into the potential limitation and the impact on the study. As this gives the study a more robust nature