

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_81520
Title of the Manuscript:	Chronic Urogenital Schistosomiasis among In-School Adolescents in Sokoto, North-Western 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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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	<p>The present cross-sectional study presents important results on urogenital schistosomiasis in adolescents residing in Sokoto, Nigeria. The authors use a combination of parasitological, socioeconomic, and clinical data to indicate risk factors associated with <i>Schistosoma haematobium</i> infection. Although the study has a good methodology, the results could be better organized. The following are my main suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The authors describe "chronic schistosomiasis", but I believe that the study does not provide enough data to prove this condition in individuals evaluated;2) Please replace "Schistosome haematobium" with "Schistosoma haematobium";3) Data on parasite burden must be cited in the abstract;4) Keywords could be: Urogenital schistosomiasis, adolescents, S. haematobium, Nigeria. <p>Material and methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) It would be interesting to present a map indicating the study area.2) Please, summarize this information: "Sokoto-North LGA had 15(7 public and 8 private) secondary schools, Sokoto- South LGA had 19(14 public and 5 private) secondary schools and Wamakko LGA had 13(7 public and 6 private) secondary schools"3) Please, add the reference about "balloting technique".4) "Students from each arm were selected by systematic random sampling technique". Which methodology? balloting technique?5) Please, summarize this information: "The selected schools were visited before the commencement of the study to discuss the significance, nature and requirements for the study with the school principals and other relevant staff, as well as to identify a vacant room for the conduct of the study. On the day of the commencement of the study in each school, the investigators were introduced by the principal or a representative, to the students and teachers during the assembly period. Free periods for data collection were identified per school, which were mostly morning break time, and detailed information about the study was given to the students from the selected classes."6) Suggestion: "Each urine specimen was homogenized and divided into 2 aliquots (how many ml?) and a dipstick urinalysis was performed on one aliquot of the urine, using 10SG Multistix (dipsticks) strips by Bayer Plc (please, add the place where the product was made)"7) Please, mention that the results obtained in the urine analysis will be qualitative.8) "Proteinuria, haematuria, and Leucocyturia of one plus and above (reference?) were recorded and considered abnormal."9) Data analysis: It would be interesting to do a multivariate analysis for prevalence and another for schistosome burden associating the risk factors that gave p values <0.25 in the chi-square test. Also, important to adjust the multivariate model by sex.	

	<p>10) Ethical considerations: “Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Health Research and Ethics Committee of Usmanu Danfodiyo University Teaching Hospital (UDUTH) Sokoto” (it is necessary to add the number of the approval protocol).</p> <p>Results</p> <p>1) Table titles need to be more informative. Tables 1 and 2 should become one, as they are results of the same questionnaire.</p> <p>2) “Associated symptoms (the correct would be “clinical signs”) and urine morbidity markers of infected respondents”</p> <p>3) Why were clinical signs not associated with parasite burden?</p> <p>4) The intensity of <i>S. haematobium</i> infection could be better illustrated in a box plot graphic.</p> <p>5) How the reference groups mentioned in the Tables were chosen? Please, clarify.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	None.	
Optional/General comments	None.	

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:	Guilherme Silva Miranda
Department, University & Country	Federal Institute of Maranhão, Brazil