



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_9600
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Schistosomiasis in adjacent human communities along the River Kochi, West Nile region of Uganda
Type of the Article	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		
Minor REVISION comments	Aim of the study should be cast in such a way that it does not repeat the title of the study Introduction well written and study is adequately justified Methods 1. What specific method was adopted for stool examination. It should be stated 2. Snail sampling procedures seem not to be standardized. Since you intend to determine the proportion of snail that shed parasite per sampling in each location, it would have been appropriate to set time for your sampling (20/30 minutes per search) Results 1. Do not present results with subheadings 2. Mean in table 1&3 should be presented with standard deviation Conclusion 1. The positive relationship between the snail intermediate host and the disease incidence cannot be adequately justified based on non-standardized sampling technique. Then rather than comparing the snail density with disease incidence, I think it is more appropriate to compare the number of infected snails with disease incidence. I am sure authors are quite aware that the occurrence of snail intermediate	Aim has been revised as suggested Methods 1. The methods for stool examination has been stated 2. It was an oversight not to state the method of snail sampling correctly. We have re-written this section to include the procedure that we followed to collect the snails. Results 1. The subheadings have been deleted 2. To include the Mean and SD in this table will overcrowd it. We have decided to adjust the table based on Reviewer 3's comments. Conclusion 1. We have maintained our earlier position since our snail sampling technique is now standardised.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	host sometimes may not solely determine the parasite transmission dynamics. Very few infected snails can cause greater harm than thousands of non-infected snails.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper was well written with clearly stated objectives. However, my major concern is in the standardization in snail sampling.	