Reviewer’s report

Title: An Assessment of Diagnosis and Reporting of Lassa fever by Nigerian physicians

Version: 2
Date: 15 February 2014

Reviewer: OLUFEMI DESALU

Reviewer’s report:

General Comments:
This manuscript assessed the diagnosis and reporting of Lassa fever by physicians in one state in southwestern Nigeria.

This subject matter addresses a potentially important aspect of medical education regarding a deadly infectious disease and control that has not been fully studied, and the work should be of interest to both clinicians and epidemiologist in the West Africa were it is prevalent.

They authors remarked that there is disparity in knowledge and practices of physicians regarding the diagnosis and reporting of Lassa fever. Thus, it is necessary to improve the knowledge and practices of physicians regarding the diagnosis and reporting of Lassa fever.

There are a number of short comings which I want to highlight concerning the manuscript.

Major comments
1. The title of the study is not appropriate and should be change to knowledge and practice of physicians regarding the diagnosis and reporting of Lassa fever in Southwestern Nigeria. As the study was only conducted in one of the 36 states. Secondly the objective did not agree with the main title.

1. The abstract is well structured and but the result section is too short.

2. The question posed by the authors was well defined however the methods were not appropriate and well described .The method was not written in accordance with guideline for writing cross sectional study and was grossly deficient. There were no subheading

3. The authors should explain how they got their sample size , the total of doctors in Osun state, sampling method and power of the study

4. The survey instrument was omitted, was it a validated questionnaire and was the study piloted among the study population? The questionnaire should be attached as an appendix for further review

5. The ethical approval reference number should be stated

6. The scoring of the questionnaire is grossly inadequate and shrouded in secrecy

7. The manuscript scoring system did not adhere to the relevant standards for
reporting and the outcome should be dichotomized into knowledge and practice score.

8. The methodology section need a thorough review

9. The discussion and conclusions is not too scanty and not robust.

Minor comment

10. The subheading respondent’s designation should be merged with general characteristics

11. References did not follow the BMC editorial style

12. I will advise the authors that the data should be analyzed with only Chi square. And if they decided to use logistic regression, it should be fully explained so that the journal readers can easily follow the methodology.

Statistical review

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

13. Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

14. Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

15. Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests.
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