

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Parasitology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_127610
Title of the Manuscript:	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONAL HYGIENE AND ASCARIS LUMBRICOIDES INFECTION
Type of the Article	Original Article

#### **PART 1: Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important as it highlights the link between personal hygiene and <i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i> infection. It shows that poor hygiene increases susceptibility to these infections, suggesting that improving hygiene can help reduce the prevalence of soil-transmitted helminths, particularly <i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i> . These findings can inform public health strategies to prevent parasitic diseases globally.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggestion: "Personal Hygiene and its Association with <i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i> Infection: A Data-Driven Analysis"	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally clear and informative, but a number of adjustments could improve its comprehensiveness and clarity. Below are my suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Context on the Importance of the Study:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The abstract briefly mentions the health problem but could emphasize why understanding the relationship between personal hygiene and <i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i> infection is crucial for public health efforts, particularly in regions with high STH prevalence like Indonesia.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. <b>Methodological Details:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It would be helpful to briefly mention the specific public datasets used and the sample size, if available, to provide a better understanding of the scope of the study.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. <b>Statistical Significance:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Mann-Whitney test significance value is mentioned, but a brief note on what this means in terms of effect size or the implications of the findings would strengthen the conclusion.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. <b>Public Health Implications:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The conclusion could briefly highlight the broader impact of the findings. For instance, mention how the results could influence public health strategies in Indonesia or similar regions.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to address an important public health issue. The approach taken in the study is generally satisfactory. However, several aspects of the study and manuscript should be reconsidered by the authors.</p> <p><b>HERE ARE SOME OF MY KEY POINTS</b></p> <p><b>Use of Abbreviation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please <b>expound the abbreviations</b> “SD,” “SMP,” “S1” that were mentioned in Table 1.</li> </ul> <p><b>Study Design and Methodology:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Please clarify the age bracket of “Teen” and “Adults”</b></li> <li>• The methodology section lacks details about the specific datasets used. For instance, it does not <b>specify how the data were collected, the sample size, or the characteristics of the datasets.</b> These details are essential to assess the generalizability of the findings and to determine the quality of the data.</li> <li>• The study would benefit from a <b>more detailed description of how “personal hygiene” was quantified or assessed.</b> Given that 5 variables were considered “Personal hygiene variable,” it should have been clarified in the manuscript how the authors generalized which participants were considered to have “poor hygiene.” Without clarity on how it was measured (e.g. objective indicators), the results may be difficult to interpret or replicate.</li> <li>• Although the authors mentioned about other potential confounding variables (such as demographic variables) that might influence both personal hygiene and the likelihood of infection with <i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i>, it was not mentioned whether these variables were included in the analysis. Without accounting for these factors, the association between personal hygiene and infection might be overstated.</li> </ul> <p><b>Results and Statistical Analysis:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The authors used the Mann-Whitney test, which is appropriate for non-parametric data, especially when comparing two independent groups (e.g., those with good vs. poor hygiene). While the statistical result is reported, the effect size or magnitude of the difference between groups is not mentioned. Understanding not only whether the result is statistically significant, but also how strong the association is, would provide more context for the findings. The study would also benefit from reporting confidence intervals alongside p-values to give a more complete picture of the statistical significance and precision of the estimates. <b>In the presentation of the result, instead of</b></li> </ul>	

Review Form 3

	<p>putting table 3, it could have been better if a figure presenting the result of Mann-Whitney test was shown (as this may be easier for the reader to understand).</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• For me, the discussion is short and insufficient.</li><li>• The discussion mentions that "several previous studies have also suggested a relationship between personal hygiene and the presence of hookworm eggs," followed by a contrast with research indicating no relationship between hygiene and helminthiasis in brick makers. However, this point is not fully explored or explained. The discussion could benefit from addressing why there are conflicting findings, perhaps by considering differences in study design, population characteristics, or other factors that could contribute to these inconsistencies. Simply stating that studies "are not in line" is insufficient without deeper analysis or contextualization.</li><li>• The discussion mentions the study in the BLH Yogyakarta City Work area (garbage collectors), suggesting it aligns with the study at hand. However, it does not consider the contextual differences between the populations. Garbage collectors may have different exposure risks compared to the general population, and the discussion should acknowledge that results may vary based on local factors, occupation, or living conditions. Without considering these variables, the findings could be overly generalized.</li><li>• While the discussion touches on the importance of hygiene practices, it does not address other potential confounding factors that could influence the results. For example, socioeconomic status, education, access to sanitation, and geographical location might also play significant roles in the prevalence of <i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i> infections. These factors are briefly mentioned in passing (e.g., "densely populated environments with poor sanitation") but not sufficiently explored. A more thorough discussion of these confounding variables and their potential interaction with personal hygiene would strengthen the interpretation of the results.</li><li>• The discussion briefly touches on the study's findings but lacks a more critical or in-depth analysis. For example, while it claims a strong association between hygiene and infection, the study could discuss the strength of this association (e.g., effect size) and whether the observed relationship is robust across different demographic groups or settings. Furthermore, it would be beneficial to address the limitations of the study and how they may impact the conclusions.</li><li>• The public health implications of the findings are mentioned but not fully developed. The discussion could benefit from offering concrete suggestions on how personal hygiene interventions could be implemented in communities at high risk for <i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i> infection. Additionally, the role of environmental factors, such as access to sanitation and education, could be better linked to the study's findings.</li></ul> <p>Limitations of the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is no discussion of the limitations of the study.</li></ul> <p>Contribution to Existing Knowledge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I commend the authors for doing such research as it contributes to the growing body of knowledge about the role of personal hygiene in preventing STH infections. It highlights an important modifiable risk factor that could help reduce infection rates in endemic areas.</li></ul> <p>Clarity and Writing Quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is some room for improvement in clarity and precision in writing, especially in describing methods and statistical procedures. More detail on how personal hygiene was assessed and the exact nature of the data would strengthen the manuscript.</li><li>• The conclusion could be more nuanced, including a discussion of how the results could be applied to policy or future research.</li></ul> <p>Overall Comment: The study addresses an important public health issue and provides evidence of the association</p>	
--	---	--

**Review Form 3**

	between personal hygiene and <i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i> infection. However, the study could be strengthened by providing more methodological details, considering potential confounding variables, reporting effect sizes, discussing thoroughly the results of the study (vis-à-vis the related literatures), and emphasizing the limitations of the study. Addressing these issues would improve the study's scientific rigor and the applicability of its findings to public health strategies.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the study are both recent and likely relevant The authors might also want to include systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and key studies on hygiene interventions (particularly those focusing on <i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i> ) as these references would further strengthen the study and make the “basis” of discussion more robust.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally understandable, but there is room for improvement in sentence structure, clarity, and consistency. Addressing these issues would make the manuscript more polished and suitable for scholarly communication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Some recommendations to enhance clarity, coherence, and overall scholarly quality of the manuscript: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simplify and Shorten Sentences: Many of the sentences are complex and could be split into simpler ones for better readability.</li> <li>• Avoid Repetition: Consolidate points that are repeated and focus on the most important findings.</li> <li>• Improve Transitions: Use clearer transitions between points, especially when comparing your study with others.</li> <li>• Check Grammar and Syntax: Perform a thorough grammar and punctuation check to ensure consistency and professionalism in tone.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	John Vincent A. Pagaddu
Department, University & Country	Cagayan Valley Medical Center, Philippines