



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_18026
Title of the Manuscript:	Intestinal parasitosis among primary school pupils in coastal areas of the Cape Coast Metropolis in Ghana
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		
Minor REVISION comments	The theme of the work is interesting because it is an important issue such as intestinal parasitic infections in children from Ghana. Work is well posed and developed properly. The manuscript is carefully prepared; the format is correct and meets the standards of the journal. The only corrections I suggest are the following: -The header of Table 3 should be before the table. -Line 119: <i>Strongyloides stercoralis</i> instead of <i>S stercoralis</i> -Line 120: <i>Trichuris trichiura</i> instead of <i>T Trichiura</i> -Line 128: shows instead of show -The authors say that the study identified eight different intestinal parasites (line 145), but only cite six. -Include the quotation [9] in the first paragraph of "discussion". -Check semicolons, dots and spaces in the list of references -It would be interesting to note the absence of amoeba. -It would also be interesting to note whether there was any sign of illness in children parasitized. -As the authors indicate at the end of the discussion, it would be interesting to continue the work by increasing the number of samples and using other stool examination techniques.	I agree with the comments to put the header of the table on top. This was done but the error may be due to formatting. With regard to Line 119 and 120, We have effected the corrections by writing the names of the organisms in full. Also 'shows' on line 128. The study identified six intestinal parasites and not eight as we wrote in the document. The mistake has been corrected. We have corrected the errors in the references particularly the use of punctuation. We did not find any amoeba in our study and we think it does not warrant any discussion. We have however discussed all organisms that were identified in the study. Our study population was clinically healthy school children. We also hope to increase the number of stool samples as well as the explore the use of more stool examination techniques.
Optional/General comments		