



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	This manuscript is an interesting work that look for risk factors associated to schistosomiasis in 2 communities of Uganda. However, there some comments about it: 1. The manuscript is technically well written but some sections require revision because they are repetitive. 2. Some subheadings require revision 3. Titles of the tables should be self-explicative. They require more details about they want to explain. 4. At the end of the manuscript, readers hope to see the difference in the risk factors between both communities. Unfortunately it was not like this. 5. Authors explain the study limitations and they remark that the small sample size probably is the primary reason associated to the observed results. However, there are other limitations. The quality of the recruited sample, the lack of reliable registers of the prevalence and intensity of the infection in the communities and migrant workers. These may are producing some bias during the data statistical analysis. 6. It is recommended that the authors can consider these bias factors if they are planning to continue working in both localities.	1. Thanks 2. We have revised some of the headings as advised 3. Table headings have been re-written 4. This has been mentioned briefly in the conclusion. We are very cautious with making very strong statements. 5. We will improve in future. Something had to get started to prompt further work 6. Noted with keen interest We have corrected the reviewer's comments that came in pdf version.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		