



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_34859
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE, PARENTAL PERCEPTION AND FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PRACTICE OF DEWORMING SCHOOL-AGED CHILDREN IN NORTH-EAST 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	INTRODUCTION: 1. Line 34-35. Scientific names should be in italics...<i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i>, <i>Trichuris trichiura</i> <i>Necator americanus</i>, <i>Ancylostoma duodenale</i>. 2. There is no indication of school health program in the study area by the Authors although discussed. 3. Line 58-59 should read: Others believed that the drugs children. 4. Lines 257, 37, 62, 74, 257, etc "school age" and "school-aged" should be consistent accordingly in the manuscript. 5. Line 64. "This same group" should be clarified. 6. The Authors failed to state the purpose of the study in the specific study area in the conclusion of the "Introduction". The Introduction did not end well. Even punctuation at the end was ignored. MATERIALS AND METHODS: 7. Line 86. The unit for the land mass was wrongly positioned. The superscript must come before the punctuation. The superscript 2 looks like a reference. Correct unit = 49,259Km². Moreover, Authors should crosscheck this figure. 8. The statement under "Inclusion/Exclusion criteria" did not deserve the heading. The statement could be added to the Study Population and the heading deleted.	1. Agreed. Scientific names have been written in Italics 2. There is no known organized comprehensive school health programme in the state except for a once-a-day feeding for Almajiris 3. Agreed. 'Some' have been deleted and 'O' capitalized in 'other' 4. Agreed. School-aged has been changed to 'School-age' 5. Clarified as " These disadvantaged groups (the poor and female children)" 6. The specific objectives have been added to the conclusion of the introduction. 7. This has been done and cross checked. The entry is correct. It has also been



SDI Review Form 1.6

	9. Line 115-116. The last statement (After signing an informed consent form, respondents were administered the questionnaire) should be deleted. This is repetition in context from Line 109-110. 10. Ethical considerations: Authors should provide traceability of the approval. Probably quote the Approval ID etc. RESULTS: 11. Line 145: The statement “These are shown on table 2 below” should be deleted. However, ‘Table 2’ can be mentioned after 13 (2.2%). Thus 13 (2.2%) (Table 2). 12. Table 2: The total sum of occupational groups is more (601) than the stated 598 sample size. Can the Authors explain this? Else statistical analysis should be repeated for quality control of all values captured in all the Tables. 13. Line 156. The last statement (These are shown on table 3) <u>must</u> be deleted. “Table 3” should be added after the last word ‘dewormed’ in the same line 156. ..their children dewormed (Table 3). 14. Line 159. Frequencies and Percentage sub-headings should be well justified. <table><tr><th>Frequency (N = 598)</th><th>Percentage (%)</th></tr><tr><td></td><td></td></tr></table> 15. Line 166: (P= 0.02). Lack of consistency in stating P-values. Line 203. P=.01 and 0.001. 16. Table 1: Authors should provide reasons why the sum of age group is 595 whilst the sum of gender is 598. If there were missing values, this should be indicated. There is no matching. 17. Line 173: Should read “Findings in Table 5. 18. Line 183; correct as above 19. Table 2 and 6: These tables can be deleted and contents detailed in the manuscript. OR contents added to any other table. This is because, these tables	Frequency (N = 598)	Percentage (%)			referenced 8. The statements in the inclusion and exclusion criteria has been added to the study population, and the headings have been deleted. 9. Thanks. The statement has been deleted. 10. The ethical consideration was approved by the National Research and Ethics Committee (NREC) Bauchi State. The approval ID: NREC/12/05/2013/16/03. This has been stated. 11. Done 12. Agreed. There was a typographical error. The figure is 15 (3.0%). See table 5 (Assocoaiton between other guardians’ factors and deworming), for confirmation of the figure on table 2. However, table 2 has been deleted as suggested by the reviewer. 13. Done 14. Agreed and corrected 15. Corrected to $P < .001$ now 16. Thanks. The reason why the number of reported age was less than the sample studied was
Frequency (N = 598)	Percentage (%)					



SDI Review Form 1.6

	have very few information to communicate. DISCUSSION: 20. Line 216. "The finding". Authors should clarify which finding. 21. Line 218: "In this study....." This should read "In this present study....." 22. Line 220. Grammatical error. As shown in Table 4. 23. Line 253-254: "With this level of acceptance, it likely that what was really lacking in the schools and the communities was a program designed for periodic deworming of the school children". This statement should be rephrased. 24. Line 261-262: Should read: ...helminthic infestation. However, there was no significant statistical relationship between the age of neither the school children nor the parents and deworming practices in the present study. 25. Line 290: table 4 in parenthesis not necessary. CONCLUSION: 1. This should be further summarised to communicate vital information from the results to the audience. RECOMMENDATION: 1. Line 325: There is no evidence for the urgency of deworming from the research findings. Stool samples were not taken for laboratory investigations to prove helminthic infection. Therefore the first recommendation should be deleted. REFERENCES: 1. References in the Bibliography should be well	because some of the respondents could not quote their age in numerical terms and it was impossible for the authors to estimate such age as they could not place a land mark or event marking when they were born. 17. Corrected 'on' to 'in' 18. Corrected 'on' to 'in' 19. Thanks. Table 2 has been deleted. However, we feel that table 6 should be retained since the information therein is not the same with any other table. The table shows the result of a multivariate analysis using binary logistic regression model with the purpose of finding the adjusted odds ratio of deworming practices among the parents/guardians. 20. The finding being referred to is of this present study 21. Done. Changed to 'In this present study' 22. Corrected 23. The expression has been
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	formatted to suit the journal. Eg. [Internet] in pages 353 and 374 should be deleted. Moreover, the in-text referencing does not follow the Authors guideline. The Authors decided to use superscript, a non-conformance to the journal guideline. OTHERS: 1. Competing interests not clarified by the Authors. Any reason? 2. Authors should obey punctuation rules. Eg. Line 116 etc.	rephrased 24. Corrected 25. 'table 4' has been deleted. Conclusion 1. Thanks. The conclusion has been expanded to include more relevant salient point from the findings of this study. Recommendation 1. Done References Thanks. Corrected in line with the journal's guideline. 1.The 'Internet' has been deleted. The in-text referencing has also been corrected in line with the journal's guideline. Others 1. Competing Interest was declared in the original manuscript sent: No competing interest exist. 2. We have cross checked and tried to obey all punctuation rules. Thank you.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. The major comments <u>must</u> be addressed by the Authors. 2. There were grammatical errors which must also be addressed.	Thank you.