

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58979

Title: Knowledge Regarding Ringworm Among the Peoples of Gazaria, Mushiganj

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
 ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study:

- Relevant public health topic
- Community based cross sectional design is appropriate
- Study includes 165 respondents
- Ethical approval and informed consent are clearly reported
- Questionnaire was pilot tested before data collection
- Knowledge of transmission, symptoms, prevention and treatment was assessed
- Results are presented with clear percentages
- Study limitations are acknowledged by the authors

Weakness of the study:

- Convenience sampling limits generalizability
- Most respondents were young and highly educated
- The actual age range was 20 to 30 years despite broader eligibility criteria
- The sample may mainly represent students rather than the general community
- Only descriptive statistics were used
- No overall knowledge score or grading system is provided
- Some questionnaire responses appear scientifically unclear
- Grammar, spacing and formatting require considerable correction

Reviewers Comments:

The manuscript addresses a relevant public health issue and provides useful information about knowledge of ringworm among respondents in Gazaria. The sample size of 165 and use of a pre tested questionnaire are positive features. Ethical approval from the Hamdard University Bangladesh Review Ethical Committee and informed consent from participants are clearly reported. However, the study has important limitations. Although adults aged 20 to 60 years were included in the eligibility criteria, the reported participants were actually between 20 and 30 years, with most having higher education. This limits representation of the wider population. Convenience sampling also reduces generalizability. The manuscript should provide a clear method for defining overall knowledge level rather than relying mainly on individual responses. There is also an inconsistency between the abstract and methods regarding self administered questionnaires and face to face interviews. Grammar, spacing, sentence structure and formatting need substantial editing. Overall, the study is useful but requires major methodological and editorial revision.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

No clear evidence of previous publication or duplicate reporting is apparent from the submitted manuscript. The study appears to present original survey findings from 165 respondents. However, previous publication cannot be confirmed from the manuscript alone. A formal plagiarism and similarity check should be conducted before publication, and the authors should confirm that the same dataset has not been published elsewhere.