SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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.**

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	**Authors' response to final evaluator's comments**
The authors have not revised this manuscript to my satisfaction. There are still several misleading statements. The current prevalence of schistosomiasis has not been updated. The methodology section is full of several assumptions, which are not clear to me. How did they arrive at a sample size of 250? What is the total population of school children in the study area? Why they not collect equal number of urine and stool samples for better comparison of species prevalence! The author stated in the result that there was no significant difference between schools for S. heamatobium infection. This is not correct as my own chi square test shows that the difference is highly significant. Same applies to infection and occupation (table 4) in which the authors stated that there was no significant difference whereas there is a significant difference (p=0.0358) **Under result, line 3. The authors include a statement on intensity.....? I am not sure if the authors know the meaning of the word intensity as I did not see any table on intensity (Table 3) as referred. It is better for the authors to provide reasons why intensity was not computed rather than provide misleading information. For information intensity is expressed by number of egg/10ml of urine or egg/1gram of stool.** **This manuscript has serious methodological issues such as selection of schools? Sample size calculation, misinterpretation of statistical test, and overall poor literature review. As stated in my previous evaluation, several works have been done in this area in Nasarrawa state, which the author failed to mention. I have marked these in the manuscript. I suggest that the author do a thorough revision and consult as statistician for advise.**	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer