



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_54393
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Crude Oil Exploration on the Physical and Mental Health of Residents of Okpai Community, Delta State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Major issues with data analysis and reporting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the abstract you say that sample size is 100 but then in the "Research design" section you say that "a total of 340 subjects were involved in the study" and then in the "Sample and sampling technique" section you say again that "a total of 100 participants were drawn from a total population of 7000". So, what is the sample size of this study? Please be clear and consistent, and also always state clearly the sample size in all figures and graphs. - You say in the abstract and in the methods that Participants were recruited into three groups of equal number of interviewees of age range 18 - 30 (50%), 31- 45 (50%) and 18 - 30 (53%). First of all, how is it possible that the total of the % is 153%? The sum of these 3 age groups should be 100% right? The issue is repeated throughout the text. More importantly, from Fig.2, I understand that 4 different age groups were considered: 18-30, 31-45, 46-60, 61-90. Why then in the text you only mention and report the first two age groups and consistently ignore the two older age groups? Then in Fig.4, you again report only the first two age groups and ignore the other two. This is a serious inconsistency which needs to be addressed. Please explain. - The group meaning are not clear. What is the difference between the 3 groups? Why grouping all the participants in 3 different groups? It does not make any sense to group the participants in 3 non-homogeneous different group if then you are not testing for differences between groups. I am really struggling to understand the reason behind this choice. What and why are all subjects divided in groups which are differing for age and number of participants? This is a serious flaw in the research design and need to be properly explained. - In the "scope of study" section you say that the criteria was residents in the target area of 15 years and above". Are you referring the the age? In this case this does not correspond to the results reported (i.e. the younger age group was always 18-30 right?). - In the abstract you say that "a significant ($p < 0.5$) increase in crude oil exploration on the physical and mental health" was observed. This does not make sense as you did not tested for any increase in crude oil exploration, nor for any increase in the morbidity of health issues. Indeed, in my view, it does not make any sense to test these differences at all using statistical tests. If you're just qualitatively reporting the results of a questionnaire, you can avoid statistical tests at all and just report the results of the survey in terms of percentages. - The total categories in the different groups shown in Fig.7 does not sum up to 100%. Totals in each category should be 100%, otherwise this graph has no meaning. It would have been probably better to report all different occupations for the 3 groups, and not vice-versa. Also in this case though the total should sum up to 100%... - Tables 1, 2 and 3 why reporting the mean? Mean percentage? Mean of what? I don't really think this is necessary, nor useful anyhow. - The question asked in the questionnaire and/or interview need to be reported. You cannot report positive or negative answers without reporting the questions. Subjects gave a positive or negative answer to what question? - When reporting the 4 subordinate themes for physical effects in the discussion, these data are not presented in the results. You cannot discuss results which are not presented anywhere... Were all different sub-themes tested as well? Why not reporting them separately in the results? Again, what were the questions? 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Minor issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in the "Research Design section you say that "group 3 was 83% in the age group 18-30, so this is not similar to Group 1, but this is actually the same to Group 2 instead. Please correct. - The whole part of the introduction dealing with air pollution is too generic. Air pollution is an extremely wide issue, so it does not make much sense to just talk about air pollution in general, especially because no data are presented about air pollution levels in the study area. Actually, most of the discussion is focused on water and fish contamination instead. - What is the statistical relation of Lord Nick? Lord, 2010 is not in the reference list. Please provide a reference. Also, since you're using a numbered citation style, so the missing reference should be added and cited with the relevant number. - What do you mean with "provision was made for attrition"? This is not clear. Also, you say that an extra sixteen subjects were added, but 6 is reported in parenthesis. Why 6 or 16 more people were added? This is not explained anywhere in the text. Why the sample size was not chosen a priori in sampling design? Why adding more people subsequently? - In the discussion, replace "oil companied" with "oil companies"? - References 4 and 5: these are exactly the same articles with different author names? Please add correct references here. - 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This article deals with a tragic story of environmental degradation and exploitation in an often neglected area of the world. This issue surely deserves attention and merit international diffusion. The stories reported in this manuscript are truly heart-breaking and the suffering of Niger delta population cannot be ignored any longer. However, serious methodological issues were highlighted during review, which in my view are greatly compromising the scientific robustness and technical validity of this work. Unfortunately, the paper is too anecdotal and the level of quality in data analysis and reporting is too low for a scientific publication. Many errors and inaccuracies were detected, serious issues and discrepancies were identified which should be addressed by the author before granting publication in a scientific journal.</p>	

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>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Giuseppe Suaria
Department, University & Country	Italy