



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_42363
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and Predictors of Entamoeba histolytica Infection Among School-Age Children In Wamakko Local Government Area, 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 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	Manuscript is quite interesting and scientifically robust But address the following points below: Abstract Line 21-25-Reasons for findings are not given in the result section of your abstract but in the discussion. Check and expunge all. The findings are not captured in the result section. Please do so. Rewrite the conclusive part of your abstract to suit findings. Introduction Line 44- Italicize latin names "Histo"and "Lytica". Your statement in the introduction should end with the aim of the study. Check and correct. Several statements on the description of the parasite. Check and expunge. Leave only one. Materials and Methods Line 106-That is not considered as a reference. Check and replace. Study population description very scanty. Consider adding few points. Line 118-Spelling error. Check Criteria and correct properly. Results Table 3 caption should be: with respect to risk factors studied. No. Examined (%) No. Infected (%). NB: Merge table 3 and 4 to form a single table. Merge table 5 and 6 to form a single table. Discussion Check grammatical error and correct please. Discussion should be done sequentially as tables are arranged, relating your findings with previous and similar studies and giving reason(s) for your outcomes. Conclusion Conclusion not capturing key findings. Please do so.	Abstract It was noted and correction was effected in line 21 to 25, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer under abstract. Introduction It was noted and correction was effected in line 44-49, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer under introduction Materials and Methods t was noted and correction was effected in line 106-118, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer under Materials and Methods Results It was noted and correction was effected in line 346-357, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer under results. Table 3 and 4 can be merge together while table 5 and 6 cannot because they are talking of different statistic ie table 5 is simple logistic regression while table 6 is Multiple logistic regression analysis. So they are entirely different tables as such should be left as it is. Discussion Gramatical error was checked and correction effected and Discussion was made as suggested by the reviewer under Discussion Conclusion It was noted and correction effected as suggested by the reviewer under conclusion.
Minor REVISION comments	Check for gross typographical and syntax errors all through the manuscript and correct. References should be arranged according to Journal guideline.	Grammatical/ typo graphical and syntax error were checked in the manuscript and corrections effected as suggested by the reviewer.
Optional/General comments	It is better to use more recent references in your article that is not older than 5-10 years. See Oti <i>et al.</i> 2017 and add to your references.	Noted and new recent references were cited as suggested by the reviewer.