

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_91680
Title of the Manuscript:	Detection of Soil-Transmitted Helminths and their Risk Factors in some Local Government Primary Schools Sokoto, 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:

(<https://www.journalijpr.com/index.php/IJPR/editorial-policy>)

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	There should be figure representative of the helminth life stages (eggs/larvae) identified in this study. These are fundamental evidence of the research claims and should be presented. There are other similar studies in Nigeria, especially from the Southern part, the discussion is void of comparison with such work especially in parasite prevalence and species diversity. There is no need for figure 1 and should be removed. The discussion is too shallow, and the content of the manuscript lacks rudiments of science in relation to pathogen research There ought to be a table showing the number and prevalence of each parasite species. This is part of the research basics from the title. This is not apparent in the manuscript	
Minor REVISION comments	Citing world wide web domain is not admissible in the reference. Such could be acceptable within the text. Other helminths such <i>S. stercoralis</i> , <i>E. vermicuaris</i> etc are intestinal worms that could be transmitted via soil. The definition for intestinal worm is broader as used, and should for part of introduction and their relationship and co-infectivity too in the introduction Abstract; how is 6.5% (pit latrine) highest compared to 33.3% (bore hole). This needs clarification.	
Optional/General comments	Table 2: tribe could be expunged	

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:	Joshua Seun Olajide
Department, University & Country	Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria