



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012 IJTDH 2606
Title of the Manuscript:	SCHISTOSOMIASIS IN IPOGUN: UPDATE ASSESSMENT ON ENDEMICITY AND EFFICACY OF PRAZIQUANTEL IN CHEMOTHERAPY.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

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

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	TITLE: would better read- Schistosomiasis in Ipogun: Current Endemicity Level and Efficacy of Praziquantel ABSTRACT: Line 33- delete a total of and change 'from' to 'of' Line 34 insert 'for schistosome eggs'; and 'of the' before pupils Line 35- insert 'these' between and and were Line 37: change 'returned' to 'became' Line 39: change 'in the village' to 'among these pupils' since the study was not a cross-sectional population – based study. Line 40: Insert "in the study area" after chemotherapy. INTRODUCTION: The references are not current Lines 85-86: to read 'Praziquantel is schistosomiasis (provide recent references) Line 87: insert 'to 60mg/kg' after 40mg/kg STUDY SUBJECTS: Lines 114 to 116- The names of the schools need to be consistent with the Tables and Figure and under Results URINE COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS: Line 125- change participants to 'pupils' Line 128- sentence is incomplete Line 129- change 'alongside to 'within' 130- insert 'single dose' before praziquantel,	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and'supplied by the Ondo tate ministry of health" after the words in parenthesis on that line. The next line should read- Treated pupils were re-screened three weeks post treatment. 6. RESULTS: Line 137; The percentage is 20% as in Table 1 and not 48.44%. It is also not the highest, rather St Jude N&P school is with 22% (ref Table1) Line 138: It is the highest and not the second highest Post-Treatment Assessment: Lines 144 -145 to read " 3 weeks after treatment of the 100 infected pupils, a re-screening to assess the efficacy of the administered drug showed that 20 (20%) of them were still infected (Fig. 1). Line 147- change P to small case. 7. Values in Tables 1 & 2 and, in Figure 1 do not agree 8. Title of Figure is suggested as : 'Prevalence of.....and not Frequency of..... 9. DISCUSSION: The results were not well Discussed and references are not current.. Line 172- no data from the study to support the sentence starting with 'A high intensity... Likewise line 187, the schools were not so described, which were the schools that were close to the village river from those studied? 10. REFERENCES: Insufficient current references cited	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dr.Margaret Mafe
Department, University & Country	Public Health, Nigerian Institute of Medical Research, Yaba, Lagos, Nigeria.