

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_130162
Title of the Manuscript:	Socio-Demographic and clinical profile of leprosy in the Regions of Brazil and outcome of new cases between 2012 and 2022
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article gives a glimpse of the current situation of the leprosy burden in Brazil, therefore has immense importance for the people working in this thematic area. Since social, demographic and clinical profile is described and correlated it adds to the available data on leprosy.	We appreciate the contributions and corrections to the article.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is suitable for the content and the study	We appreciate the contributions and corrections to the article.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Study design should be corrected. 'To build....' is not study design, it is aim of study. In methodology the meaning of ecological study can be omitted instead the procedure how the surveillance was done can be mentioned in short. Conclusion is to be modified; eg- 'In addition' should be avoided as there is no conclusion given prior to that statement. Key words can be increased : socio demographic profile, surveillance	We appreciate the contributions and corrections to the article. Adjustments were made to the terms in the objectives, keywords and conclusion.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is scientifically correct. Few changes in the result description and interpretation are to be made according to the findings. Comments given based on previous studies are to be avoided and present study interpretations are to be high lightened. Eg:' Thus, the long duration of symptoms for untreated leprosy patients has been another significant risk factor for physical disabilities and, therefore, there are still gaps in comprehensive health care for affected individuals, making it necessary to strengthen the screening and active search for cases, especially in poorer regions with a high incidence in Brazil.'...This statement is not relevant here as the author has not compared or studied the duration of the disease. Simply patients age cannot be an indication of prolonged disease duration.	We appreciate the contributions and corrections to the article. Changes were made to the description and interpretation of the results, in line with the conclusions.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, references are sufficient and latest. Accessed on could hve been added for few. Eg: ref no;1,5,6,8	We appreciate the contributions and corrections to the article.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the language proficiency is of good quality.	We appreciate the contributions and corrections to the article.
Optional/General comments	There are few ideas and observations made by the author which are presented as the results of the study, but have to be added as the recommendations. The article is scientifically good but there are repetitions in the results and discussion which can be refined. I have given in detail the opinion in the word doc of article.	The comments made by the authors have been modified for the article's recommendations. As for the repetitions in the results and discussion, the text has been revised so that they do not occur again.

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	There are no ethical issues in the manuscript, given that secondary data were used and are freely accessible to all.