

Review of: "The Imperative of a Comprehensive One Health Approach for Mosquito-Borne Disease Control in Indonesia"

Simon P. Kigozi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Comments:

1. In the introduction, first paragraph, there is a laboured effort to place the current study within the “one-health framework,” but it is rather confusing as presently put. For instance,
 - (a) The approach around mosquito-borne diseases doesn't clearly articulate how the 'animals' arm of the one-health framework is included here.
 - (b) It appears that the mosquito-borne diseases strategy is being suggested as an equivalent to one-health implementation without a clear linkage to the tenets of the one-health approach as extensively presented in the paper.
 - (c) Then, one would have expected that the essence of one-health would be a lot clearer than the proposed mosquito-borne disease concept, making the latter almost unlikely to explain the former.
1. In the ‘Understanding the One Health Approach” section, it’s not clear what the last sentence of the paragraph is talking about.
2. In the ‘Interconnectedness of Human, ...” section, the sentence on “Changes in the natural ...” may not be true given that ‘change’ could mean many different things and thus could not possibly always have the effect as explained.
3. Again in this section, it is not clear when you say “... efforts to control vectors have resulted in an increase in mosquito ...”, given that massive human activities may mean so many different things, including activity towards urbanization that is known to reduce the risk/burden of malaria. There is a level of use of sweeping statements that may be misleading to readers.
4. Also, in this section, you have used a lot of content for which the sources are not cited, which is quite concerning. For instance, the sentence in lines # 8, 10-12
5. Cross-sector collaboration ... section: It's not clear whether the author means that it's the mandate of the institutions referred to here to jointly carry out vector control. That may need to be stated first before this claim of a gap.

Moreover, is this a "gap between institutions" or a potential opportunity for these institutions to pool resources and capabilities for high impact? This is quite confusing as stated.
1. Key focus areas for ... section: It's not clear what the sentence in line # 6 of paragraph 1 is talking about, particularly as regards “alarming areas ... “

2. In this section too (paragraph 2), there is a lot of material that is not referenced appropriately. For instance, content in line # 4-7.
3. Also, in this section, paragraph 3, the sentence in line # 1 is not clear. The content in sentences in line # 4-6 needs proper referencing, as does content in line # 8-9.
4. There are quite a number of abbreviations used that don't quite relate to the explanation given. For instance, mortality rates are summarized as CFRs. Please consider using more intuitive abbreviations.

Overall: This appears to be a summary of content from “one health resources/documents” (the source of which was not adequately cited) and a very weak juxtaposition of the one health agenda with a frequently mentioned but rather unclearly explained approach to mosquito-borne disease control. There was no data, as there was no study conducted on mosquito-borne diseases, nor was there a review of literature on the same.

As such, the relevance of this paper is really unclear.