

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

Eric Ouattara¹

¹ Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Bordeaux

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for this interesting study on Dengue fever, which is an Emerging Infectious Disease of particular interest in the context of global warming, leading to the widespread distribution of vectors in new regions. The world is more than ever at risk of a massive Dengue fever epidemic.

Major comments :

- The primary outcomes need some clarification. The authors should specify how the "likelihood of timely dengue fever diagnosis" was measured or how "access to appropriate treatment" was measured. They could specify if the outcomes were collected by patient self-report or based on experts' definitions. The following variables, "healthcare-seeking behavior," "cultural background," and "healthcare accessibility," need to be clearly defined with their procedures of collection. The authors should specify how the latter variables were retrieved from the patient charts. Of note, only "healthcare accessibility" was presented in the tables.
- The purpose of table 4 is not clear, and the table seems to present the same message as table 1. If correctly understood, the paper aimed at analyzing differences in terms of access to care, treatment outcomes, or complications between males and females. Authors could think of presenting a table, for example, with "access to care," which seems to be the more important outcome as the predicted variable of the logistic regression, and gender as a primary predictor adjusted on the other variables listed in table 4. A non-significant Odds Ratio for gender regarding access to care and adjusted on the other predictors will strongly argue for equitable care for both males and females. Another analysis with complications as the main predicted variable may also be interesting to assess the difference in terms of care after admission between males and females.

Minor comments :

- In the introduction, the aim of the study is repeated 2 times. The 5th and 6th sentences could be moved to the end of the introduction as specific objectives.
- In the Methods
 - * The aim of the study is repeated in the first and last paragraphs of the methods and should be removed from the methods.
 - * Ethical consideration was also repeated 2 times; authors should remove the second occurrence.
- In the Results
 - * Table 1: "Access to Healthcare" needs to be defined in the methods and the table footnote.

* Table 2: What is the definition of “total complications,” and why is it repeated in the table?

* Table 3: What is the difference between "Total dengue cases" and "Diagnosed Cases"?

Thank you again for this interesting work.

Best,