



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_24501
Title of the Manuscript:	Soil Transmitted Helminthes; prevalence, perception and determinants among primary school children in rural Enugu 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract Requires formatting Introduction - The introduction is too long. It can be shortened to 1½ or 2 pages; Parasite names should be italicised - Lines 37-39, sentence is contradictory - Lines 67, how do STHs promote poverty? - Line 83, the use of 'we' should be avoided in the introduction. Replace it with 'there' - Line 88, sentence to end with "...making deworming a routine in primary schools in Enugu state, Nigeria". Materials and methods - Replace methodology with materials and methods - Lines 117-118, the statement should be supported by a reference - Line 123, delete microbiology - Line 125, how was confidentiality ensured since pupil names were used for participant identification? - Lines 131-135, were there any health workers (nurse) on the research team or were the participants referred to a health centre if they had any problem? - Line 133, an empty sachet is not proof that someone took the medication as one can discard the contents & present an empty sachet. There should have been another way to ensure compliance, for example, parents accompanying the children to school on the	-It has been formatted -Introduction has been shortened -Thanks, but I don't think the sentence is contradictory -Parasites name changed to italics -modified we....there -effected -Changed -Refereced -Deleted _initials were used -Researcher is a medical practitioner (Public Health physician) as well as assistant though they were meant to report to the teachers who will help contact health workers. BUT Antihelminthics are very safe drug with little or no side effect.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	day the dewormers were being given (if they wanted to be present). - Lines 140-142 (data analysis), it's not clear what the grading of proportions mean. MODIFIED Results - The presentation of results is not systematic. There should be a clear separation of data from the children and the parents. I suggest the following subheadings: - Prevalence of STHs in school children - Questionnaire survey findings - Relationship between STHs infection in children and parents demographics - Past tense should be used when reporting results - Lines 162-167, there is no coherence; the names of the protozoan parasites should be given if they were identified. - Line 174, sentence beginning "Majority of the parents had poor knowledge (<50%)...". If they were less than 50%, then they cannot be majority. - Line 179, sentence beginning "about 134.....heard...." be specific which group is being referred to here? - Lines 187-193 is a repetition of table 6. If a table is used, briefly reports the important findings in text format without repeating the table. - Data from parents in table 1 and 2 can be combined - Table 2: the titles in columns 2 and 3 do not appear to correlate with the data under them - Table 4 and 5 can be combined, and data aligned in the second column (table 5) Discussion Lines 264-266, the reason given for most parents having 2 or 3 children enrolled in school is not entirely true.	Equally I course of the research no side effect was reported -That is the only practical/possible way as getting parents to come will them is not feasible Subheadings A – D included as suggested -Names of protozoa put in bracket NB it is a coincidental finding as they are not Helminths. -<50% removed as it is referring to knowledge score not proportion of parents -Respondents to questionnaires -modified -Table 2 now data from parents but table 4 and 5 could not be accommodated in a page at font size 10 so we left the way it was -Effectuated
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Parents may be prolific but may not have the capacity to send children to school. An economic reason would be more appropriate Line 267, is there an explanation for the high percentage of people using the bush as a toilet or for sewage disposal? Line 289, "... worm infection dropped marginally...". I think a drop from 25.6 to 2.8 is not marginal. The drop is quite substantial. Lines 295-296, delete last sentence, it's a repetition of results; delete the sentence.....including eating without gaining weight...groups (lines 298-300). Lines 312-317 should be summarised as it is repeating the results Lines 341-343 to be deleted as results on shoe wearing are not reported General comments: the discussion should be written in a systematic manner, start with findings from the children, then parent data and finally risk factors. Repetition of results in the discussion should be avoided Conclusion • Can be summarised to 3 or 4 sentences • Sentence in line 349 350 should be deleted because it is not mentioned in the methods/results whether teachers were interviewed, and the findings are not reported. Ethical issues: Yes. It is not clear how confidentiality was ensured since participant names were used for identification.	Reason proffered Modified Effected Modified Deleted THESE HAVE BEEN EFFECTED
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Be consistent in the number of decimal places • Table 1: data should be aligned • References require formatting; format on journal names should be the same, follow journal guidelines (e.g. some are abbreviated while others are not)	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		