



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_5736
Title of the Manuscript:	THE PREVALENCE OF SCHISTOSOMIASIS AMONG PUPIL IN NASARAWA TOTO, NORTH CENTRAL NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors only provided prevalence results from two schools, in Nasarawa State, Nigeria. They failed to provide intensity of infection which can be used to measure the degree of morbidity of the disease. The authors also fail to provide information on the control of schistosomiasis currently ongoing by Carter Center in the State. This to me will have an impact on the prevalence of the disease. Did they find out first if the LGA have been treated or not? The current estimate of global prevalence of schistosomiasis is about 700 million. The authors should see (Steinmann, P., Keiser, J., Bos, R., Tanner, M. and Utzinger, J. (2006). Schistosomiasis and water resources development: systematic review, meta-analysis, and estimates of people at risk. Lancet Infectious Diseases 6, 411–425.) Conclusion: This is not a conclusion but a recommendation. Results I am not surprised at the low prevalence reported for <i>S. mansoni</i>. It is expected with only a SINGLE stool sample examination. Authors should have done double or triple stool examination which is standard for <i>S. mansoni</i> in low prevalence areas.	Corrections effected Corrections effected Corrections effected Corrections effected

	Finally, the sample size is too small for the author to make a generalization of the study to Nasarawa Toto. I suggest that the two locations used in the study should be stated in the title. Under discussion The author is not correct to compare their results with that of Ekpo et al, as the two studied age group are different. Ekpo et al studied preschool children (0-6 years). There are many other studies in Nigeria that can be used as comparison. The author just need to do a little more literature reviews	Corrections effected Corrections effected
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Study Design: Cross sectional not Investigative I think significant is assumed to be $P < 0.05$ and not $P > 0.05$	Corrections effected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is interesting except that it full of avoidable mistakes, which the authors can rectify and make it a better paper.	Corrections effected