

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

Collins Otieno Ogari¹

¹ Miami University of Ohio

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

A lot can be done to improve the paper:

1. **Abstract:** The background needs to be sufficient and have a good flow to it, mentioning the impact of Buruli Ulcer from a global perspective all the way down to the municipal level i.e. Jasikan. **Methodology:** This section can also be improved further by giving more details on sampling, sampling size, and also talk of time period. The sample size also seems to be small and no indication of how this was determined. **Results:** Results given are insufficient and more can be added including the outcome of Buruli Ulcer among different genders, ages, etc. **Conclusion and Recommendation** can also be improved by generalizing and not just focusing on the municipal level.
2. **Introduction and methods:** Some of the paragraphs are insignificant and should be removed, for instance when you talk of the seasons in the study site. It is also not clear whether the sex ratio is 91:9 as stated. You talk of a census method used under research study and a random sampling method at the beginning which I believe are two different methods and the methodology should be made clear. Under your study population, you talk about residents included in the study, give a list of symptoms, and include confirmed Buruli ulcer patients, but no mention of how the cases of Buruli were confirmed. I believe the Gold standard is by use of IS2404- targeted PCR method and symptoms alone do not suffice.
3. **Results and Discussion** are insufficient and can be improved by providing more data and better comparison and analysis.

I would therefore not recommend this manuscript for publication based on the summarized comments below.

1. The aims of the manuscript and the results of the data are not clearly and concisely stated in the abstract.
2. The abstract does not accurately summarize the contents of the manuscript.
3. The introduction does not provide sufficient background information to enable readers to better understand the problem being identified by the Authors.
4. Authors need to provide sufficient evidence for the claims they are making, in addition to including more experiments or data from the hospitals stated.
5. The authors did not mention any similar claims published elsewhere on the prevalence rate.

6. The Authors haven't made it clear how the data presented in the Author's manuscript is different or builds upon previously published data.
7. The data presented can be of high quality if analyzed correctly, the authors need to use the number of subjects surveyed for period prevalence.
8. The methodology used is not presented in a clear and concise manner so that someone else can repeat the same experiments.
9. The authors have not presented a balanced survey of the literature and information so their data is put into context.
10. Grammar and references still need to be improved.