



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_12579
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of knowledge about Schistosomiasis among paddy rice farmers in Doho and Kibimba, eastern Uganda
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:

(<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	References: - Line 196 is not different from line 209. - The spelling mistakes must be revised through the whole text. Example; verify words such as: Schistosomiasis sees Lines 187, 188, 183. Sampling, farmers see Line 173.	-Deleted reference 2 and corrected the numbered mistakes
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Replace "meager incomes and no education" by "low incomes and poor education". The sentence "Considering that... health issues" need to be revised. It should be sort and concise. The authors should go through the language to improve or facilitate the understanding of the text. Build short sentences. Line 146, Read and write <i>Phytolacca dodecandra</i> but not <i>Phytolaccado decandra</i>	Replacements have been done and sentence reconstructed
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Line 60: Are the small the small farms own at their home by casual labourers the rice farms? If the answer is YES, Have you investigated the potential risk of infection in their own farms? Throughout the questionnaire, did the authors assess the level of water contact among respondents? This aspect is also important and can allow the author to argue that labourers are suffering from a water-born disease. Considering the statistical distribution of labourers in Doho rice fields (3800 farmers participating on plots) and in Kibimba rice fields scheme (about 500 casual labourers who spend very long hours in the rice paddies), despite the fact that the farmers are casual, the	Yes, but we have not investigated the risk on their farms. We will in future expand our geographical and time scope to take care of this. We did not assess the level of water contact but the farmers at Kibimba start work on the farm at 9am, break off for lunch at 12noon and resume at 2pm till 6pm. Most of those at Doho start work at 9 and leave by 3pm. We have acknowledged sample size as one of the limitations to our conclusion. Doho rice scheme was undergoing restructuring at the time of our



SDI Review Form 1.6

	authors could have sampled more than 50 and 40 farmers respectively from Doho and Kibimba, in order to reflect the real magnitude of the disease in the two areas. The study is made up of 2 samples (Doho and Kibimba). Questions to the authors: Are the two samples dependent or independent? Is there any other statistical test that can better illustrate the analysis of your results apart from the chi-square test? Line 132: Could the authors indicate two or three characteristics of each factor or variables, exemple: Symptoms of schistosomiasis (haematuria...).	study making many farmers unavailable. For Kibimba, the same labourers were working on the farm the period of time we conducted our survey. In addition, much of the area was covered by mature rice, a period of time when there is less activity on the farm. We didn't test for differences between the data sets from Doho and Kibimba. We assumed that since the nature of respondents considered was different at the different study sites, we decided to treat each sample indecently. We also do not seem to have knowledge of any other statistical method that can be used for testing for differences in proportions other than the Chi-square. We will appreciate if the reviewer suggest an appropriate method These have been included
--	--	--