

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

Rim Abdelmalek¹

¹ Faculty of Medecine of Tunis

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The subject is interesting for a better understanding of Buruli Ulcer epidemiology. Life screening is also difficult to perform. The authors are to be encouraged for their choice.

I have some points to propose and to ask for:

1. When the authors are describing the localisations and geography, I propose to add a map. It will be easier to view and locate.
2. In "methods," the authors announce a sex ratio at the municipality of more than 90?!! Is there a mistake to clarify?
3. For the sample size (methods also), we need the reference and the formula, if possible.
4. In "results" and for the size, it is not clear: how many people did you contact? The authors are searching to assess prevalence; if they do not have the number of inhabitants interviewed, how will they conclude?
5. In table 1, there are two abbreviations. Authors have to write them under the table in full letters.
6. For the 56 retained cases, authors have to clarify if they were all confirmed and the method of confirmation.
7. In table 3, authors have many points to explain. If all 56 patients were confirmed, how can we have only 32 samples and between them 19 are pending?
8. The final prevalence calculation must be more explained. For that, the formula used and the sample size must be clearly mentioned.
9. I recommend that the authors write the bacteria's name in italic form.

Overall, the subject is interesting, as well as the efforts made, but there are some unclear points that must be improved and clearly mentioned. You will find the PDF attached with my annotations and questions.