

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_SAJP_118037
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Gastrointestinal Parasites Among Secondary School Students in Nanka Orumba North L.G.A, Anambra State
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://journalsajp.com/index.php/SAJP/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- The prevalence of IPI particularly NTD and its risk factors are of great importance for each region, in order to design appropriate control strategies for NTD elimination according to the 2030 Road map. Thus, data provided by such study if scientifically presented, would be important for the scientific community.</p> <p>2- The title of the article is suitable if the author could confirm that participants from the Agiligaba are secondary school students and not high school ones.</p> <p>3- the abstract lacks clarity. The study period, the different type of parasite detected are not presented. One word is mission at the end of line 3 The numbers are not well presented, the author should but the number of participants and the respective percentage should be put into the same comma: i.e <i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i> (n=29; 43.94%). Stating that a group is infected more is not correct, the infection is presented as type, prevalence, rate or intensity (number of parasites per g of stool). All the differences presented are not statistically significant, the percentages are too close and the p is always higher than 0.25, thus the results are misinterpreted.</p> <p>4- Yes</p> <p>5- The manuscript needs to be revised, the results are not well presented. The authors should not repeat the data presented in Tables in the text. The interpretation of the data analysis (statistical analysis) is not correct. If there is no difference between groups, this is also a result. The global general characteristics are not presented, mean or median age, gender and other known associated factors according to site, if no difference exists between sites, thus it would be more suitable to No bivariate or multivariate analysis was performed to determine the IPI-associated risk factors. There are too many tables: table 1 and table 3 are not informative. The authors should delete it. There is no information regarding the polyparasitism. Are <i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i>, <i>Hookworm</i> and <i>Entamoeba histolytica</i> the only parasite species detected? Could the authors provide their sample size calculation?</p> <p>6- The references of studies performed in Nigeria are old. The status of IPI prevalence would have changed if some interventions were performed for the control of IPI. Thus it is important to provide the study period of the data presented and to compare it with data from other authors in Nigeria , around the same period and according to the intervention (discussion section).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, although some words are sometimes missing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bouyou Akotet
Department, University & Country	Universite des Sciences de la Sante, Gabon