

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_92937
Title of the Manuscript:	Intestinal Helminthiases Among School Children in the Sahelian and Sudanian Zones of Chad: Prevalence and Risk Factors
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:

(<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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>INTRODUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This section is rather short and consequently lacks a robust information that should characterize a full-length research article. 2. The authors reported that intestinal parasitosis causes many deaths. This should rather be reported conventionally with a referenced annual mortality rate. 3. The aim of the study partly contradicts the title of the article by underscoring interest in the factors associating with pathology: the title gives impression that the authors meant to investigate the risk factors associated with prevalence. <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Authors need to explain how schools, classroom arms, and pupils were sampled. 2. What type of microscope, and objective were used to examine the samples. This is important. 3. Information on how the eggs, larval, and adult stages of these parasites were identified (with appropriate references) in stools is very vital. 4. How was the sample size determined? 5. Information on ethical clearance and informed consent of subjects is vital. <p>RESULTS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors stated that 6 and 13 schools were sampled in the Sahelian and Sudanian zones respectively. One, this information is rather better for the materials and methods section. Two, the sampling was lopsided as it lacks a level ground for comparison. It should have been roughly even for both zones. This is a serious limitation. 2. The total number sampled was not evenly distributed across-board based on gender, and number of students sampled per province as observed in Table 1. Again, something is wrong with the sampling method employed. 3. I expect to see figures showing at least the eggs of the parasites examined. <p>DISCUSSION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. STROBE reporting format that requires a summary of key findings in the first paragraph will be better. 2. Information on study limitation is lacking. 3. This section needs appropriate paragraphing. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Ankylostoma" is wrong; "Ancylostoma" is right. 2. All zoological names as well as "et al" should be italicized. 3. "Montresor et al., 1998" was cited in the introduction without keeping to other citation pattern across the manuscript. Consistency is essential. 	
Optional/General comments	This manuscript has paid attention to a subject of interest in Parasitology and Public Health.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Atalabi Tolulope Ebenezer
Department, University & Country	Federal University Dutsin-Ma, Nigeria