



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_8778
Title of the Manuscript:	URINARY SCHISTOSOMIASIS AMONG FULANI PASTORALISTS IN RIVERS STATE
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	It is a privilege to assess this manuscript as it observed <i>Schistosoma</i> burden among a rare case of population in Nigeria. My observations concerning the papers are appended below Abstract 1. Aims should be aim 2. Urinary schistosomiasis is now termed urogenital schistosomiasis because the disease morbidity is associated with the urinary and genital tracts 3. Intensify should be intensity 4. I found classification of intensity into light, heavy and very heavy odd. The WHO standard usually recognises light and heavy infection while some other modifications from the WHO standard have classified intensity as light, moderate and heavy. So, is there reference for this classification? If yes, provide such in your materials and methods but if not use standard classification 5. What is the meaning of <, >, do you mean $\geq$ and $\leq$? Please use the standard symbols 6. Delete the statistical section from your abstract, it is only required in the materials and methods section 7. It is necessary to add the standard deviation (SD) to the mean egg count (86.6$\pm$SD) 8. Replace encampment in keywords with	Aim Urogenital schistosomiasis Intensity light, moderate and heavy ≤ 50 eggs/10ml of urine = Light infection; $\geq 50 \leq 100$ eggs/10ml of urine = moderate infection; ≥ 100 eggs/10ml of urine = heavy infection Expunged Please that was not done herdsmen



SDI Review Form 1.6

	herdsmen Introduction 1. Line 44 with WHO should be appropriately referenced 2. Line 50-recreation/activities should be written as recreational activities 3. Line 57- haemotobium should be written haematobium. Then since this is the first appearance of the scientific name of the parasite in the text, it should be written in full while subsequent appearances should be abbreviated 4. Line 61- Schistosoma haematobium abbreviated as S. haematobium 5. Introduction was without rationale for the study and was poorly concluded Materials and methods 1. Line 80- the use of systematic random sampling for this type of study seems to be inappropriate, authors should describe the sampling procedures. It could that they used simple random sampling. 2. Line 84 -restructure sentence as follows -most bush encampments in the study areas depend on pond, water bodies, shallow wells, seasonal streams and domestic water supply for drinking. 3. Line 85- what do you mean by not protected? 4. Line 96- Cheesbrough is a reference, so it should be numbered 5. Line 98- delete full stop	[4] Recreational activities. <i>Schistosoma haematobium</i> <i>S. haematobium</i> Several studies on urinary schistosomiasis in Rivers State had tended to focus on school-age children and adults, with little or no emphasis on Fulani pastoralists in the State. The present study is a preliminary investigation on the prevalence of Urogenital schistosomiasis infection amongst the Fulani herdsmen in Rivers State Simple random sampling Most bush encampments in the study areas depend on pond, water bodies, shallow wells, seasonal streams and domestic water supply for drinking. Expunged Cheesbrough [13]. . deleted
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6. Line 103- 5000rp for 5min is confusing. Do you mean 5000rpm for 5min note rpm is revolution per minute? So, present appropriately. 7. Line 106- the use of 'were' is inappropriate 8. Line 108- use intensity instead of intensify 9. Line 109-110- use standard classification categories 10. Data analysis section- what statistical software was used? Information on this part was insufficient. Was only ANOVA the only package used. ANOVA will only test for significant differences in intensity of infection. What of Chi square which is a test of association between prevalence and age, sex and other variables measured? 11. How was the sample size determined? 12. More importantly, there was no ethical consideration for this study. The proposed study was supposed to be reviewed by the Institutional Ethical Review committee, especially, in this kind of study where the participants are basically the minority group. Fulanis are native of Northern part of Nigeria, a complete different ethnic group from South-south where the study was carried out. Further, they have complete different sociocultural background, with usually very poor educational level and are predominantly muslims. Because of this background, they can be regarded as a vulnerable group. So, a strict ethical consideration is expected to be carried	5000rpm Where Intensity Light infection - ≤ 50 eggs/10ml of urine, moderate infection $\geq 50 \leq 100$ eggs/10ml of urine, heavy infection ≥ 100 eggs/10ml of urine Frequency distributions were obtained and ANOVA was employed to test significance. Data analysis was done using SPSS version 10.0 of the SPSS software package (SPSS Inc, Chicago IL Considering the strict socio-cultural and religious observances peculiar to the herdsmen, people who gave their consent from different bush encampment where used Ethical approval was gotten from the ethical committee of the Rivers State Ministry of Health before the commencement of this research. However, letting the investigators' proposal pass through the institutional ethical review board, was not done but permission was gotten from Army Barracks 23 Artillery, Obinze who was in control of the Fulani herdsmen and who also provided the interpreter during the course of this study.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	out for this group of subjects and this can only be achieved by also letting the investigators' proposal pass through the institutional ethical review board. Results 1. Line 119-120- As this sentence is, it seems to mean 593 urine samples were infected with <i>S. haematobium</i> whereas it is 593 pastoralists that were infected. So recast the sentence 2. Line 120- mean intensity should be accompanied by SD and present all value in 1 decimal place. The same goes to other sections where mean intensity was being presented 3. Line 125- use the correct symbol for chi square 4. Table 1- add SD to all mean values. No consistency in the table. Let each subheading like NE, NI, NNI, light etc carry % in bracket after them, then delete all the % within the table. The same goes for other tables 5. Figure 1 and 2 can be collapsed into a table. 6. Line 159- Correct the statement, 76 is higher than 72 7. Line 169-170. Delete the highlight. Simply say, intensity of infection varies significantly across age groups ($p < 0.05$) 8. Line 181- correct the highlight accordingly	Of the 593 Fulani pastoralists urine samples examined from six bush encampments for <i>S. haematobium</i> 394 (66.4%) were infected Corrected ($p > 0.05$) Corrected Prevalence 92 (76.0%) followed by 82 (72.2%) Intensity of infection varies significantly across age groups ($p < 0.05$) The age 31-40 years had the highest prevalence of haematuria 96 (88.1%) and 69(59.5%) proteinuria while the least was the age group 1-10 years with 50.9% and 41.5% proteinuria and haematuria respectiv
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Discussion 1. Line 197- water cannot be infected, so restructure the phrase 2. Line 210- the author(s) earlier stated that no snail intermediate host was sampled. So, this reason cannot be justified. So, this reason cannot stand. Other probable reason could have been due to sociocultural differences between the fulanis and the reported population (e.g Ugbomoiko's study was conducted among yorubas). Since there may be discrepancies in the extent of exposure to water between these two populations as the Fulanis especially their women are not always permitted to expose their bodies in the public due to their religion and beliefs. this was also supported by your observation which showed lower prevalence and intensity in the female folks 3. Line 212-213- the highlighted sentence is not clear 4. Line 228-229- delete the highlight 5. A dart of information was given as regards haematuria and proteinuria in relation to urogenital schistosomiasis	Recasted Expunged Yes, Ugbomoiko's study was used because of paucity of data on the study population Expunged Expunged References on the highlight provided
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Yes, I suppose the study protocol is also meant to pass through institutional ethical review committee	Ethical approval was gotten from the ethical committee of the Rivers State Ministry of Health before the commencement of this research. However, letting the investigators' proposal pass through the institutional ethical review board, was not done but permission was gotten from Army Barracks 23 Artillery, Obinze who was in control of the Fulani herdsmen and who also provided the interpreter during the course of this study.