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 *Cryptosporidium*** **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	

	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.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Nkem Benjamin.I**
Department, University & Country	**Medical Research Unit, Federal Medical Centre Owerri, Nigeria**