Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRIZ_50563**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A Survey of Urinary Schistosomiasis among Secondary School Students in Jalingo Town, Jalingo Local Government Area, Taraba State**
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	- State the full names of the schools abbreviated in the abstract. - State the statistical test/ tool you used for your analysis. - Check the grammar and punctuations for clarity. • Statistics - You failed to mention the statistical tool/ test used and the level of significance for your study in your methodology. • Laboratory analysis -Is the name of the laboratory used is called Microbiology Laboratory or Microbiological Laboratory? • Study Area - There is a need to state the names of the schools selected for the study. • It is not appropriate to refer to your tables in the text by saying, "See table 1, table 2 etc. Rather, you can say "As shown or showed in Table 1, Table 2" as the case may be or you may just cite the table in a bracket after you have made statements on the table. You can read articles accepted online for several styles for citing your tables. • Avoid the use of the word "A strong positive correlation between age and the prevalence". Rather, you can say that, "There is a statistical significance between age and the prevalence of the infection". When you mention strong positive correlation, most people will ask you whether you carried out correlation and regression statistical analysis. • The titles of your tables are too long. You don't need to mention the study area in those titles since the main title for your study has taken care of that. • There is no need of the footnotes in your tables if you have appropriately mentioned it in your methodology. • The title of Table 5 seems to be vague. Can one swim in rainwater? When talking of schistosomes, sources of contact may include water contact activities e.g. fishing, irrigation farming. Sources of water such as: ponds, streams, lakes, dams etc. Recast the title appropriately or you delete it. • In Table 6, is the colour of urine having any significance in determining the prevalence of this infection? Your Table 7 takes care of bloody urine is very useful in suspecting the parasites in the samples.	1. This is unnecessary as it can tannish the image of the schools 2. Chi-square (done) 3. Done. **Statistics** It has been done. (chi-square at 5%level of significance) **Laboratory analysis** The name is Microbiological Laboratory (done). **Study area** 1. There is no need mentioning the names of the schools as it's a betrayal of the trust of the schools. 2. Done. 3. The issue of strong correlation has been corrected in the manuscript. (Done). 4. The titles of the tables have been adjusted (done). 5. Footnotes at the base of tables have been removed (done) 6. The title of Table 5 have been adjusted (Done) 7. Table 6 has been removed from the manuscript (Done).
Minor REVISION comments	- Check your introduction for some minor punctuation. - Recast the sentence where you tried to state the need for the study for better understanding.	Done. Done.

	• Ethical clearance -The phrase “Only those who parents agreed”. Replace who with whose. -Apart from the letters of introduction to the schools and consent forms, didn’t you present the proposal for ethical clearance by an institutional review board in the area? • DISCUSSION - Check good articles in journals on how to cite authours appropriately in the text. - Try as much as possible to compare your works with other works carried out in your country, than citing other works in other countries when you a lot to cite in your country. - What does LGAs stand for? Give the full names and then you can bracket the abbreviation. - Try and check the entire manuscript for grammar, spellings and punctuation. - Your conclusion is too long. You stated some information that is not necessary for your conclusion. • REFERENCES - Some of your references were not properly written. Ensure you read and comply with the instructions for authours on the style of writing the references section.	**Ethical clearance** Who has been replaced with who (done) The proposal was not presented for ethical clearance by any review board. **Discussion** **Done** **Most of the citations used in the discussion were those from Nigeria.** **L.G.A. has been corrected in the manuscript (done).** **Done.** Done.
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	