



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Abstract: Aims: please add Regions of Tanzania Conclusion: review, there seem to be a repetition Key words: please add “ irrigation schemes” Introduction: Line 20: add year after Sosovele et al., Line 26: change improving to improve Line 37: the study in reference 12 was done in China and is not suitable here. Line 41: please delete “a” after create Line 43: please add “s” to problem Line 55: the study in reference 21 was done in Philippines and not China as you stated, equally reference 22 carries information on the construction of the Georges Dam in China as reported by Ross et al., 2001 and cited by reference 22, please check this and review. Materials and methods Line 75: the reference Salehe et al., 2012 should be replaced by the appropriate number on the list of references for uniformity. Line 112: please for better understanding, state the data that was analysed using the binary logistic regression model. Results and discussion:	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 134: add “as the” after schistosomiasis Line 140: please add the percentages of participants of Mwega and Kikafu Chini Line 147: the use of “However” here is not appropriate because there is no link with the previous sentence, please review. Line 179: please check, I suggest you consider: the findings are in line with those of Chimbari, (2012) in Zimbabwe (27) who reported that... Line 194: please elaborate on: removal of vegetation and control of disease, and possibly give some references. Line 209: you may review as follows: “it was observed that, there was no significant statistical association between predictors and disease occurrence in both Regions. Line 224: please delete “s” from “samples” Line 227-250: please consider deleting all tables 3a, they seem not to add any information to the article since you have stated the information above. Line 260-311: the information on the statistical procedures seem not to add anything to the article, I suggest it should be deleted. Equally, it is necessary to show the Wald values. Line 313-322: please state the main finding and discuss it. Avoid explaining the statistical procedures. Line 325-341: please avoid explaining the meaning of OR, I suggest you state the risk factors that contribute to disease transmission and discuss under section 3.2.5. Hence, the subsection odds ratio should be deleted. Line 356: consider changing “this result imply” to “this observation implies”. Further elaborate briefly on the water demands of the said crops. Line 360: I suggest you review Table 3e and use the	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	following sub headings on columns: variables, categories (e.g. age groups for age; male, female for sex; etc.), prevalence within category, OR (CI) and P-value. All non-standard abbreviations should also be defined below the table. Line 382-392: please review this subsection. Equally add values of prevalence. Line 415: I suggest you review the beginning as “observation from the scheme in Chabi showed that”... Line 431-436: this looks like a conclusion. Please state the observations clearly and attempt discussing them especially ii and iv. Line 456: the word “social” does not describe the activities, select an appropriate word (s). Line 459: please recast as suggested: “these results concur with the findings of others”. In like manner state the references properly. Line 460: please delete Moreover, also remove “s” from “shows”. Line 462: state where and when the studies in references 31 and 32 were carried out. Line 467: please add “s” to “variable” Line 487: please delete “s” from “shows”. Line 490-493: please explain how these practices are linked to disease occurrence. Line 495: consider replacing “attend” with “seek” Line 511: please consider deleting “Moreover” and replacing “maintained with stated. Line 517: add “the months with” after “constituted”. Section 3.3.2: please compare the findings here with others elsewhere. Line 553: the study in reference 33 was not carried out in Mkindo scheme and so may not be appropriate here.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Conclusion: Line 579: The use of “the study concludes that” here is not appropriate, it is the author who concludes and not the other way round. Please also consider revising the last paragraph in conclusion. Recommendation: Line 593: replace “to provide” with “should”. Please state the recommendations without commenting on them. Line 598: recast as above References: I suggest you consult the journal web site for the referencing style. Check especially year, issue and page numbers of publications.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Introduction: Line 59: sentence from Nonetheless to problem seems too long and unclear, you may consider reviewing it Materials and methods: Line 96: you may consider defining the key informants you used in this section Results and discussion Line 163: consider changing “Regarding to places” to “with regards to”. Line 176: consider replacing “leads to” with “influence” Line 178: replace “are to be” with “were” Line 187: “However” does not seem appropriate, you may consider: “similarly” or “in like manner”	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	An interesting article on a topic of public health importance. However, many errors need to be addressed.	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.
Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Calvin Bisong Ebai</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Zoology and Animal Physiology, University of Buea, Cameroon</i>