



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_35462
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATE THE EFFICACY OF MICROSCOPY AND PCR IN THE DIAGNOSIS OF URINARY SCHISTOSOMIASIS AMONG PRIMARY SCHOOL CHILDREN IN WAMAKKO LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF SOKOTO 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 o f Novel ty**', 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	- Five positive samples out of 50 are quite a few samples to draw any conclusions. - Figures: A positive control is missing. - It is not accurate to conclude that microscopy is the gold standard, for-as the authors express- there exist hybrids between <i>Schistosoma bovis</i> and <i>S. haematobium</i>; and PCR must be used to confirm the result (as the authors express in the Recommendations). - Reference N° 22 is missing.	It is noted with great respect. It has been corrected as required It is noted and corrections effected It was inserted as directed
Minor REVISION comments	Page 8, line 193. Discussion: Please begin the sentence: Fifty urine samples...and not 50 urine samples.	It was noted, and corrections effected as directed Fifty urine samples
Optional/General comments	- The methods, tables of data and figures are sufficient to understand the study, but positive controls are missing in the PCR figures. A positive control receives a treatment with a known result, so that this positive response can be compared to the unknown response of the treatment. - The conclusion should be revised for the arguments are contradictory. As there exist hybrids between <i>Schistosoma bovis</i> and <i>S. haematobium</i>, it cannot be concluded that microscopy is the gold standard. Besides, only 5 samples were found positive out of 50.	It was noted and corrections effected as directed for positive control in the figure mentioned. It was noted and corrections effected as directed by the reviiwer