



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_29532
Title of the Manuscript:	URINARY SCHISTOSOMIASIS AND ITS RELATED ANAEMIA AMONG CHILDREN IN A HIGH RISK COMMUNITY IN GHANA
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	1. Repartition of study population is not any result obtained. It should be put elsewhere. Line 21 2. Schistosoma (S). S in bracket is not necessary :line 38 3. The type of schistosomiasis caused by each schistosoma species need to be indicated; line 38 and 39 4. Line 66: the bracket on 11.2% not necessary 5. Line 68: Schistosomiasis and not schistosmiasis 6. Line 71. In the at study: delete at - The introduction is not well organised. Some ideals found at the middle are normally suppose to be at the beginning of the introduction: Line 62..... 7. Totalling is line 108 is not correct 8. Did the authors conduct stool test and blood test to exclude those who were infected by hookworm and malaria? If yes what about other parasites like ascaris and amoeba species which could also cause anemia. These informations should clearly be stated (Line 112). 9. The authors should give reasons for collecting samples between 10am-2pm 10. Line 135: I don't understand how parasites ova could be seen in blood samples following lysis of red cells. The authors should crosscheck the method description 11. Intensity of schistosmiasis infection is normally classified as light, moderate and heavy. I don't know why moderate infection was not evaluated during this study.	(S) has been removed as suggested. This correction has been done as directed. Bracket has been removed. Has been corrected. Has been corrected. 8. Yes, parasitological tests were performed to exclude children with malaria and hookworm. This has been stated in line 110. The test however, did not include test for <i>Ascaris</i> and <i>Amoeba</i>, because our previous checks revealed that malaria and hookworm infection are more common. 9. Number of ova in urine varies throughout the day, being highest in urine obtained between 10am-2pm. 10. Samples taken for analysis as already indicated are urine samples to determine ova of <i>Schistosoma</i>, and not blood. The lysis of red blood cells was done for only bloody urine samples for clear and easier detection of the ova.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	12. Reference for anemia threshold should be give (line 141) 13. The authors used which test to compare parasite intensity? Chi square test is only used for prevalence. 14. The % of participants with moderate infection is required in such studies (line 155-156) 15. Line 158: Among should be used instead of from which. Such errors are very common in the text. The English should be revised thoroughly 16. The authors have indicated any where in the text the probability values for significant and un significant values. They are needed The English should be polished for better understanding especially at the level of results. Inappropriate use of words eg: within in line 169, 170 Globally, the results are not really clear because of poor use of English. How did the egg load vary in the different variable (sex, age, village) I think the participants were normally supposed to be interviewed and not the parents. This could have permitted to understand the knowleged the participants have on the disease and the risk at which they are exposed. 17. Frequency of contact with water site and not frequency with... 18. Line 218-222: sited..., treatment of..., communities be...; sited near are poorly used. 19. Line 232-233. The author stated in the study design that the age was between 5 and 15 years. In the discussion they talk of participants below 5 years. Which is paradoxal. 20. % included in the tables should be removed. Tables titles are also not correct: eg Table 3: Prevalence of anemia in study participants seems	-The Hb reference range to determine anaemia has been stated for the children as 11.5-15.0 g/dl. A child below 11.5g/dl was anaemia. Correction has been done. P-values have now been added where necessary, and English polished, as suggested. The statement has been corrected. Corrected as suggested. The error has been corrected. The age group of children includes 4 year olds, thus 4-15 years. This correction has also been effected in the study design. (%) in tables have been removed as suggested. Also, corrections on Tables titles have been
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	correct, table 4: Infection rate of urinary schistosomiasis related to gender seems also preferable. Globally: the authors need to revise this manuscript very carefully so as to bring it to publication standard. The size of the sample population to was too exact and can not really be representative. Carrying out an epidemiological study of this nature on only 100 participants might not have the real reflecting results and conclusions drawn from such studies may be misleading.	effected as suggested.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		CORRECTIONS HAVE BEEN HIGHLIGHTED IN GREY COLOUR