

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

Utpal Sengupta<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Leprosy Mission Trust India

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Comments on the manuscript entitled, "Prevalence of Buruli ulcer among residents in Jasikan municipality: A cross-sectional study"

The authors have surveyed the population of Jasikan municipality of Ghana to find out the prevalence of Buruli ulcer in the community.

The following comments are as below:

1. The "Introduction" should start with the aetiology of Buruli ulcer.
2. While describing in 'The Method' under the 'Study Site' the authors mention of sex ratio, fertility rate and seasons, low lying areas, rice cultivation, types dwellings, et. All these have to be supported by citing references.
3. Under the "Study Population" the authors should describe the group of wounds, as Buruli ulcer is also a variety of wound.
4. Under the "Sampling Methods" the authors should provide a reference for the "Census Approach Sampling Technique".
5. Results have to be described in detail based on the data presented in the tables. Self-explanatory tables have to be provided with their legends separately.
6. Size of the population screened has to be provided which was used for per cent and frequency calculations in Table 1.
7. Heading of Table 2 reads as "Epidemiological and clinical guidance of Buruli ulcer in cases"

What is meant by "guidance"? Does it mean "types"?

1. In Table 2 also size of the population has to be mention for calculation of percentage.
2. Heading of Table 3 should be as "The status of disease condition of Buruli ulcer cases, frequency and per cent of samples taken and outcome of PCR testing".
3. When biological samples were taken from all cases then the procedure of sampling and PCR methodology with the details of the PCR probe have to be mentioned under the methods.
4. Formula for calculation of prevalence has to be clearly mentioned in detail.
5. The statement "It was shown that.....at the time of the study."..... under discussion. Do the authors mean the finding by the Jasikan Municipality Health Directorate when compared to the present study? If it is, then the sentence does not clearly convey the message.

6. The last sentence of discussion, “Therefore, the use of case search .....suspected cases of Buruli ulcer.”  
The expression should be more specific and with a strong note.
7. Under “Conclusion“.....the disease.....” Should be replaced by Buruli ulcer. The sentence can be reworded with more emphasis for the present study.
8. Reference cited under “Sample size determination”, Kelsey et al (1996) has not been listed under ‘References’
9. Under “Abbreviations”, only one has been listed. Other abbreviations have to be mentioned.
10. The Figure does not indicate anything, and it is not meaningful at all which appears above the article. It does not indicate anything. It should be removed.
11. Considering the above points, the manuscript is not acceptable for publication in the present form.