



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_26669
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and Risk factors of Urinary Schistosomiasis in the Ikata-Likoko area of southwest Cameroon
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	Research work contributes to knowledge. Abstract and Introduction: Authors should consider manuscript. Results: I advice authors to merge table 1 and2 together content are similar. Also, values should be properly documented such as 7(23.3%). Authors should review table's content properly. Results presentation should be in order of importance as it is on the table. Discussion: Authors should follow results presentation with proper reference to all values. Also, authors need to show strength of their research work by showing similarities and weakness of their research work. It is significant to quote values during research presentation and citing of reference values. I advice authors to consider manuscript for further corrections.	Authors sincerely appreciate the comments of reviewers. Results: Agreed, table 1 and table 2 have been merged. Values have also been well documented as recommended by reviewer. Results presentation follow the order in the tables, but not all results are commented. Discussion: The order of results is respected We appreciate the comment on similarities and weakness, but we think that similarities have been shown by comparing with the several references in the discussion. For the weakness of the study we have done so in the limitations Also, considering that the limitations carry a reference, we would like to disagree with reviewer's recommendation that we insert them at the end of the section "conclusion". We feel it will be a repetition quoting values of results in the discussion. In like



SDI Review Form 1.6

		manner, we think that values of references are available in their publications and are numerous and so quoting all of them may make reading of the article uninteresting.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Yellow tinted texts are suggested corrections and red texts are possible corrections.	