



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_13138
Title of the Manuscript:	URINARY SCHISTOSOMIASIS AMONG SCHOOL AGE CHILDREN IN EBONYI NORTH SENATORIAL DISTRICT OF EBONYI STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Sampling methods used to sample subjects needs to be explained in details. Correct/Cross-Check the prevalence proportions to add up to a total of 100%. COMMENTS ON THE REVIEWED ARTICLE <u>ABSTRACT</u> The authors need to explain the statistical tests in lines 11-14 appropriately; is there a statistical difference in sex (line 12) and Age (line14); the Chi-square results and df can be excluded from the Abstract and state only the specific P-values. P values are best stated in exact amounts not as <0.05; since the computer gives specific values. Authors should state exact p-values throughout the write-up. A sentence or two about the materials of the study and how subjects were sampled will better enrich the abstract. <u>INTRODUCTION</u> The authors have given a good description of the Epidemiology of the disease but need to include data(percentages) to better illustrate the burden of the disease in school aged children as a way of giving a rationale for the study. <u>MATERIALS AND METHODS</u> <i>Study area:</i> How many primary schools are in the study area? How many	Ok. thanks I have observed your focus and understanding to the abstract page especially on the P-values. I believe the manuscript is more better in this shape.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	pupils per school? Are these rural or urban in nature? Lines 75-77 are irrelevant and should be deleted. <i>Methodology:</i> This is too skeletal; what is the basis of sampling different number of children in each school? What is the basis of selecting the proportion of sexes? What sampling technique was used to select the senatorial district, LGA, schools and pupils? The methodology needs to be graphic enough to ensure it can be replicated anywhere in the world; for comparism. <i>Laboratory methods:</i> It would be important to state which part of the urine stream the subjects produced, at what time of day and how the urine was stored or if it was analysed immediately it was produced; as these factors are key to findings. RESULTS Table 1: Age group <6 should be stated as 4-6 and 17 as 17-19. Total of prevalence should add up to 100% but it is way above it; please cross-check. Table 2: Same regarding total prevalence.	It is observed necessary and good in this text. It is stated now, thanks. Ok.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Write P values in exact numbers not in relation to 0.05. State time of day and if urine was collected mid-stream, terminal or beginning of urination and how urine was stored before analysis.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Studies should be reported in past tense.	