



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_43962
Title of the Manuscript:	Historic Socio – economic Status of Urinary Schistosomiasis in Riverine Areas of Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Case study

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>)

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	This was an historic study, funded by the Nigerian Government, that was done in October 1996, 22 years ago: Now it is not a current study (sic). This study was relevant 20 years ago: NOW HOWEVER this study should be updated. This study found that 39 to 55% of the sample, mean 48%, had Schistosomiasis and recommended that the government of Nigeria provide preventative and prescriptive training plus drugs to treat the Schistosomiasis. This study had 20 references, 10 from 2000 and earlier and 10 from 2003 to 2009. This study should be updated with (1) references from the last decade ie 2008 to 2018, (2) Information about actions taken by the Government of Nigeria to control Schistosomiasis in the last 20 years . (3) Results of the government actions in (2) above, (4) The results from a resurvey, say in 2016, 20 years after the 1996 survey written about in this paper. If no resurvey is available then the paper could be published as is with the note that a resurvey is pending.	
Minor REVISION comments	Many grammatical, lexical and collocation mistakes have been corrected in the edited version of this present paper, which accompanies this review.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Said Usman
Department, University & Country	Syah Kuala University, Indonesia