



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_20779
Title of the Manuscript:	IMMUNOASSAY METHOD AS DIAGNOSTIC TOOL FOR ENTERIC AMOEBIASIS AND CRYPTOSPORIDIOSIS IN SOME RURAL COMMUNITIES, OF KWARA STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the 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	ABSTRACT. Line 4. Do you mean Abreacts or Abstract Line 10. Oocyst Cryptosporidium or Oocyst of <i>Cryptosporidium</i> Line 13. MZN; What is the full meaning? It should precede abbreviation. INTRODUCTION Line 39. [2] and [4] is better referenced as [2,4] Line 53. Generic name should be written in Italics Line 60. See comment of line 10. METHODS Line 64. Finetune grammar Line 65. Do you mean pretty traders or petty traders Lines 78 and 79. Don't describe sample collection under the subtitle of sample examination. Line 86 and 89. See comment for line 53. What were the inclusion and exclusion criteria for selecting the pupils and stool samples? RESULT Line 109 through 111. There are inconsistencies in table 1. For instance, the title of the table is "sex distribution of...", but sex is not captured in the table. Secondly, on the first and second column, summation of the number of positive and negative samples exceeded the total sample size of 160. The negative samples on each	Line 4; Correction effected Line 10; Correction effected Line 13; Correction effected Line 39: Correction effected Line 53: Correction effected Line 60: Correction effected Line 64: It is fine tuned Line 65: Noted and corrected Line 78 and 79: Moved to sample collected Line 86 and 89: Corrected Now stated



SDI Review Form 1.6

	column exceeded the sample size. The calculated percentages are not correct if what you tabulated as the number of negative samples on the first and second columns is correct. DISCUSSION Lines 133 through 145. Highlights of lines 133 through 145 do not suit the logical order and nature of discussion section. Some of the points should be in the introduction while others in methods. The result should be discussed vis-a vis that of previous researchers. Line 162. Do you mean collaborated or corroborated? REFERENCES Name of journal should be written in italics. Effect the correction where necessary. Line 215. e541-e544 is not consistent with pattern of citing pages as you applied in other references.	Noted and modified Line 162: Correction effected Noted and corrected
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		Thank you for your observations and corrections