



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_30784
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of schistosomiasis occurrence and risk factors influencing transmission in different surface irrigation schemes in Morogoro and Kilimanjaro Regions, Tanzania.
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	The title should be "Schistosomiasis occurrence and risk factors influencing transmission in different surface irrigation schemes in Morogoro and Kilimanjaro Regions, Tanzania." Kindly indicate the species of <i>Schistosoma</i> you worked on. Abstract: the method of writing abstract should be strictly followed. Thus kindly remove the study design and place and duration of study. Additionally, statistical analysis and number of respondents are not appropriate under methodology. Be direct to the point. For result: mention the number of respondents to a specific factor and state the level of significance. Your conclusion should reflect the status of schistosomiasis in the study area and suggest method of control. Please kindly make sure that et al., is well written as <i>et al.</i>, (italicized) all through the write up. Your grammar and sentence construction should be well presented to avoid being wordy and incoherent. Methodology Kindly note the following: - Study area should include the longitude and latitude of the study area. - Study period should be consistent. Why the disparity between period of data collection in abstract (October and December, 2011) and methodology (October 2011 to October	-line 2- correction done-a word "assessment of" is removed from the title. Researcher worked on <i>Schistosoma haematobium</i> and <i>Schistosoma mansoni</i>. -in the abstract it is indicated that schistosomiasis recorded cases from January 2002 to December 2012 were collected from the hospitals and nearby dispensaries. -correction done: see highlighted sentence under results -corrections done: methods of control included. - corrections done: <i>et al</i> is italicized through the write up. -a) corrections done: longitude and latitude of the study area included in line 78 to 82. b)hospital recorded schistosomiasis cases from January 2002 to December 2011 were collected from nearby hospitals and dispensaries while data on activities involving water contact patterns were collected through questionnaires. Activities involving water contact patterns were collected through direct observation in one year (from October 2011 to October 2012).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2012). Comparing schistosomiasis prevalence data of January 2002 to December 2011 with questionnaire of October 2011 to October 2012 is not appropriate. It could have been a better research if questionnaires were administered to individuals tested positive for schistosomiasis infection. Please kindly state the statistical package used. Did you use SPSS or Graph pad prism e.t.c. Result and discussion Firstly, those titles underlined may not be necessary Secondly, Table 1 and Table 2 can be combined and titled risk factors influencing transmission of Schistosomiasis. Please kindly indicate number of respondents and respective level of significance. The discussion was not clear enough since the result was not compared to other researchers' work neither was it justified sufficiently. Only include unavoidable plates and their titles should be properly stated below them accordingly. Your plates are too many and should be reduced. Ethical Issues: No. however ethical clearance should be presented.	-SPSS version 16 was used in data analysis. -number of respondents is indicated in table 1 (n=240) -correction done: results compared to other researchers work in line 184 to 185, 381 to 382, and 384 to 385. -corrections done-plates 5,6 and 7 deleted from the manuscript and the titles are stated below the plates. - Corrections done-Ethical clearance attached in Appendix 1 line 699.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please kindly ensure journal names (under references) are italicized as supposed. Check line 620, 632, 649, 653 e.t.c	- corrections done-journal names are italicized
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please kindly check your grammar and sentence construction. Technicality is low	