

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJTDH_92375</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>INTESTINAL PARASITES IN SCHOOL-AGED CHILDREN OF RUMUODOGO, EMOHUA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA, RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original research article</b>

### **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**

	<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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Author should state the statistical tool used in analysing the data and if such was not done earlier, the author should endeavour to do that and include such information in the spaces provided in line 15, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26 stating if the data is statistically significant or not. The statement has been provided in the appropriate places as a guide.</li> <li>2. Approval from school authority and the participant only are not enough for sample collection from human subject. The author should therefore, obtain ethical clearance/ approval from the appropriate body such as the ministry of health, research and ethical committee in medical research etc. and attach a copy here.</li> <li>3. Heading 2.5. The author must state clearly the parameters that were compared using the chi-square and as mentioned above must include the output and interpretation in the result sections as well as under each table.</li> <li>4. The author must provide the plates for all the parasites species observed/ identified in this study</li> <li>5. The discussion need to be supported by more articles and properly arranged following the under listed order as in the tables:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a.                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.The author did not state the statistical tool used to analyse the data</li> <li>2. there was no proper ethical approval for the research</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The author should recast the statement highlighted in line 27 and 28 or delete completely.</li> <li>2. The Author should provide a better opening statement that precedes line 38, most especially on intestinal parasite to flow with the statement in line 38</li> <li>3. The Author should include the number examined while the percentages should be in parenthesis to enable the reader know the population size in each category</li> <li>4. Include a source of your information about the study area, i.e. heading 20.1, line 74</li> <li>5. state whose method you adopted in collecting your samples</li> <li>6. state clearly the author and year of publication of the identification keys used in line 104 and how the stages of protozoan you came across</li> <li>7. The tables shouldn't have the vertical lines, however, this depends on the format adopted by the journal house. Sample has been provided under table 1. Also there is no need to include the number not infected on the tables.</li> <li>8. The author should state how epidemiological and demographic data were obtained. Was it through questionnaire or oral?</li> <li>9. State the reason for the variation in the prevalence recorded in this study with other reports</li> <li>10. The author should state their subjects whether they are primary or secondary students and the name of the school.</li> <li>11. The statement in line highlighted in line 156 is not sufficient to support the argument. The author should look for other reasons to support their findings.</li> <li>12. The author should provide another argument to support his findings. Line 162-165 and also clarify the statement: his is consistent with [17]. In line 165</li> <li>13. The author should rewrite the conclusion, work the references.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ishaku James Maikenti</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Lafia, Nigeria</b>