Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJTDH_43809**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Prevalence of Soil-Transmitted Helminthes among School Pupils in Gia and Kajelo communities in the Kassena-Nankana East and West District in the Upper West Region of Ghana Using Direct Wet Mount technique and Formol-Ether Concentration Technique.**
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	**Abstract** The abstract needs some revision. • Methods: Where were the children recruited from? • Results: nothing is said here about the comparison of the two techniques. More results will need to be included here after further statistical analysis as recommended below. • Conclusion: is a prevalence of 9.04% high? I suggest you use the WHO definition to classify prevalence. **Keywords:** I suggest you add school-age children and Ghana. **Introduction** • It is not clear to me as to what is the rationale for this study. What were the objectives? • The prevalence of STH in this study is quite low. Can the author(s) describe study area clearly including the control activities of STH in the area? Which worms are endemic in the area? Are there regular deworming programs going on in the area? If so, which population are being targeted? Which drugs are being used? How frequent is the deworming? How effective is the deworming campaign in the area? **Methods** • Use a map to complement the description of the study area if feasible. • How many primary schools are in the selected sites? What is the criteria for selection of these two primary schools for this study? • Describe sampling technique. How were the participants selected to ensure good representation of the entire school? • Describe how the sample size of 394 overall was determined, and how the sample size was determined for the different schools. • There is no need to describe the procedure of the direct wet mount and the formol-ether concentration techniques since citations for the detail procedures have been provided (ref 11 and 12). You may only describe them if there are some substantial deviation from the procedure provided by the citations. • In the statistical analysis, how was sensitivity, specificity, and positive predictive values were determined? Present their formula. **Results** • Since there is a separate section for the discussion, you don't need to discuss within the results. • Delete table 1 since all the data contained within has already been presented in the preceding paragraph. • Include the 95% confidence limits for the overall prevalence of STH for both techniques. • The headings within table 2, 3 and 4 need to be formatted correctly. • Tables 2, 3, and 4 could be combined into one large table and the different methods presented using different columns and appropriate headings. Format the headings clearly. • Lines 191 – 197: was this part of your objective? This should be clearly stated in the introduction and the results also presented in the abstract. • Using tables and appropriate statistical tests, also present and compare the overall prevalence of soil-transmitted helminths between the different age groups, the sexes	

	and the two primary schools. • In the section of diagnosis accuracy determination, also perform analysis of the negative predictive value and the overall agreement between direct wet mount and formol-ether concentration techniques. • Why is the parasite intensity not presented? Since the direct wet mount technique had a low sensitivity, it would have been more informative if you could determine the detection limit of direct wet mount using the formol-ether concentration technique. I.e. determine the maximum parasite intensity below which the direct wet mount could not detect infection. **Discussion** • Lines 236 – 240: discuss and compare sensitivity, specificity etc. with other studies that have also compared the two diagnostic techniques. • Lines 243 – 246, 247 - 249: the author(s) state that other studies comparing the 2 techniques have been performed but provided just one citation. Which are the other studies?	
Minor REVISION comments	**Abstract** • Line 12: delete prevalent. **Introduction** • Lines 31 – 32 is not clear, rephrase. • Lines 29, 47: “school-age” is one word. Correct this throughout the manuscript. **Methods** • Line 74: Are the ages in years or months? • Lines 82 – 84 is not clear. Do you mean “…take the specimen containers home? **Results** • Line 170: do you mean prevalence of soil-transmitted helminths in Kajelo community? **Discussion** • Lines 236 – 238 is not clear. Do you mean the overall prevalence…? • Lines 241 – 243: “…lower” not “…lowest” since you are comparing two methods.	
Optional/General comments	The author(s) compared two methods in the diagnosis of soil-transmitted helminths in pupils in an endemic area in Ghana, the direct wet mount and formol-ether concentration techniques, and came to the conclusion that the direct wet mount technique had a low sensitivity. The findings are of interest. However, the methodology is poorly described and the results will need some further statistical analysis. There are a good number of grammatical errors that will also need to be corrected. My comments to improve on the quality of the manuscript are presented above.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Tebit Kwenti Emmanuel***
Department, University & Country	***University of Buea, Cameroon***