



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_11803
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Study between Molecular and Different Diagnostic Methods of Schistosma haematobium Gezira State Sudan
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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Introduction: well done 2. Methodology : lack clarity. Here in the methodology section, you should put the most important things used in doing this research. The authors should include: 2.1 The number of participants in the study and the time at which the research was conducted. 2.2 How the samples were selected to include as a study subject. 2.3 What were the inclusion and exclusion criterias? Because some students might be in a problem of kidney like bacterial infection. 2.4 What did you made for positive participants for S. Hematobium. Did you treat them or not? It is un ethical to leave positive cases. They do have the right to be treated. 3. Result: lack clarity and needs modification 3.1 Correct the serial number of result (change 2.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Result to 3. Result) 3.2 The sentence in line number 126-127 “Filtration technique is gold standard test for detection of <i>S. haematobium</i> as 127 recommended by WHO [10] (French, et al 2007)” Is not write in the result section rather put in the introduction section. 3.3 The way of writing in the result section should be formatted. I think ou do have two optionsto write the result section : either list all the subtitles like [filtration technique, microhaematuria, ultrasound] under the title Parasitological Examination of <i>S. haematobium</i> or leave the them and write the results as the sequence of the diagnostic techniques in the methodology section. A. Socio-demographic data B. The results obtained in each diagnostic techniques C. Comparison results of the different diagnostic techniques with the gold standard methods D. The table number (table 1,2,3...) or the figure number (fig. 1, 2...) in parenthesis in front of each result. 3.4 In Comparison between different diagnostic techniques: The results of sensitivity and specificity of methods are stated but there is no column in Table 3 which shows the sensitivity and specificity of diagnostic techniques against the Gold standard at 95% CI. Where do get	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	them? The authors should incorporate the sensitivity and specificity at 95% in Table 3. 3.5 Table 2 I think Table 2 is missed in the result section. Probably the ultrasound result is not stated in the result either in table or figure Discussion section: well discussed ✓ The sentence in line number 153 which say “Eighty three study subjects were selected; age range between 8 - 20 years.” Should be written in the methodology section rather in the discussion section. ✓ In this section, discuss only your results in relative to the result of the other scholars. For example when you discuss the pathological conditions of your participants, you are also discussing the conditions of the Nigerian participants. Though, your result is comparable to the Nigerian participants, you do not know the inclusion and exclusion criteria’s of the Nigerian participants and the disease condition. So, authors should discuss and justify only their own result in terms of the others. (line number 180-185) ✓ Rewrite from line number 186-200 Conclusion: Conclusions in the abstract and in the conclusion parts are contradicted. Authors should modify the conclusion. Reference: corrected base on the authors guide line	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Grammar correction : ✓ A lot of grammar errors are recorded in the manuscript ✓ Remove “an “ in line no 79 ✓ Remove the second “was examined” in line no 87 ✓ Don’t start a statement with number [e.g. 54.2% in line number 127]. “54.2 %(45/83) of the students were 128 positive to <i>S. haematobium</i> by filtration technique. But rewrite as “The prevalence of <i>S. haematobium</i> among the study participants was 54.2% by filtration techniques.” ✓ Minor grammatical errors in the result section in line number 141 is” change to was 144 “is” change to was 146 “is” changed to was	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The flow of the methodology, the result and the discussion section should be coherence	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tadesse Hailu Jember
Department, University & Country	Department of Microbiology, Immunology and Parasitology, College of Medicine and Health Science, Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia