

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_89902
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiological Studies of Polyparasitism and Gender Risk Factors in Women in Igede Land
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:

(<https://www.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy> )

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Title of the project</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With a cross-sectional study design and X<sup>2</sup>-value it is imposibel to study <b>risk factors</b> rather it is better to say <b>associated factors</b>.</li> </ul> <p><b>Abstrcut</b></p> <p>I found the abstract <b>is too poor</b>. because of the following limmitations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The introduction</b> part is not inline to the objective. The statement should better specifically to the study population.</li> <li><b>Material and methods</b> part should clearly mention the study design, study period area, sampling technique and study population including eligibility criteria and method for analysis</li> <li><b>Result part</b> should narrates the overall prevalence of poly-parasitism as well as some of the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants</li> <li><b>Conclusion part</b> is not in line to the result as well as the objective of the study.</li> </ol> <p><b>Material and Methods in the body of manuscript is also poorly presented.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The study period is not clearly stated</li> <li>The sampling method is not clearly known.</li> <li>The population (source and study population) is not mentioned</li> <li>An eligibility criterion is not clearly stated.</li> </ol> <p><b>Sample size calculation is not clear.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What mean "p = expected prevalence" and what is its exact value.</li> <li>What about non-response rate?</li> <li>Sample collection tool and source of data are not clearly stated.</li> <li>Pre-test was not conducted.</li> </ol> <p><b>Blood Sample</b> was processed for only diagnosis of malaria. What about other haemoparasites?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Malaria diagnosis process via RDT is not the golden standard.</li> <li>The role of performing PCR is not clearly stated.</li> <li>Which sample type was processed via PCR, is that positive or negative sample?</li> </ol> <p><b>Results and discussion part is not also clear.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Socio-demographic part is not state basic information about women (age, residence, occupation academic status, monthly income, pregnancy, etc.).</li> <li>The overall poly-parasitism is not stated very well.</li> <li>The overall infection rate as per each Socio-demographic characteristics is not mentioned.</li> <li>The diagnosis discrepancy between conventional (microscopic and RDT) and PCR is not clearly stated.</li> <li>The discussion part is not informative.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The authors should calculate the 95% CI of the overall prevalence of poly-parasitism to</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<p>compare and contrast with previous findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. The comparison articles should in line to the current study unless comparison is in possible.</li> <li>iii. The justification to the discrepancies of the finding is too general.</li> <li>iv. The prevalence of each parasitic infection is not markedly discussed.</li> <li>v. The association factors of the poly-parasitism are not also discussed and justified very well.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The reference style in the body of the manuscript is not correct (both Harvard and Vancouver style have been used, which should be corrected).</li> <li>6. The conclusion should better to re-write again in line to the finding with considering recommendation.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>The introduction part is not informative as per the objective of the study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. It doesn't correlate the burden of poly-parasitism with gender particularly women</li> <li>3. It doesn't narrate about the possible factors for co-infections (poly-parasitism)</li> <li>4. I couldn't understand, what was the real gap that initiates the author to do so? #</li> <li>✚ Grammatical errors should be well addressed</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✚ The topic is somehow interesting, however the overall writing and reporting system is not good for me. Basically the abstract, material and methods, the result and the discussion part are not well presented. The objectives of the study and the way of result presentation are not correctly in lined and the final rate of ploy-parasitism showed that issue was not that much a problem in the area. Thus, I recommend <b>Serious Major revision.</b></li> </ul>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Dagninet Aleign Emiru</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Arba Minch University, Ethiopia</b>