

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

Mukumbuta Nawa¹

¹ University of Zambia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study addressed Buruli ulcers one of the Neglected Tropical Diseases which an important disease in the settings where it was carried out. My overall comment is that the study may have under represented the actual prevalence in the municipality because they relied on community leaders, churches and other structures to direct them to the cases. Secondly they excluded those who were too sick. There is a high likelihood that those with mild or subclinical diseases would be left out, so this limitation needs to be included in the limitations. Otherwise the researchers tried their best without funding to report on this important NTD. The following are my specific comments:

Introduction:

The introduction lacks the global and regional perspectives, it just starts with the historical perspectives in the past to present. Let them give the global, regional, national and then focus on the study site.

Methods:

Study site narration is too lengthy, let them reduce it to be more concise to even two paragraphs concentrating more on known risk factors such as proximity to rivers, demographics and occupations.

The authors mention that the sample size was 56, yet they also mentioned that they used a census, this is confusing. I suggest they remove the 56 and just say they used census. Even if they say census, it is still important to state assumptions and formulas used to arrive at the adequate sample size to detect the prevalence. I have seen that from the prevalence calculation used 73K figure so let them use the finite population Yamane (1996) formula. The Kelsey 1996 that they referenced is not even listed in their references.

Under data collection in paragraph 3 they talk about matching the cases with controls, This is not necessary in a descriptive cross-sectional design. Please remove that. The controls were not even reported, all the three tables reported only the 56 cases.

The statistical analysis is very scanty even for a descriptive study. They have stratified the respondents by various characteristics like age, sex, education, occupation; all this needs to be described. They have characterized the various presentations. let them describe how prevalence would be measured. Finally they said they used significance level of 5%, I have not seen any statistical significance calculations as they only presented frequencies and percentage. They should either remove the statement of significance testing or actually conduct the statistical significance tests like chi-square or t

tests whichever is applicable to the type of data and its distribution.