



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_42364
Title of the Manuscript:	EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDY OF INTESTINAL PARASITIC INFECTION AMONG PATIENT'S ATTENDING USMANU DANFODIYO UNIVERSITY TEACHING HOSPITAL, SOKOTO, NIGERIA
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	<p>Authors from Nigeria present an epidemiological study on intestinal parasitic infection, which is often reported from this country, but which keeps its interest in view of the vastness of this country.</p> <p>This is a well written paper but that also raises a number of comments that I will list below. On the form, four main remarks must be reviewed and corrected to perfect this article.</p> <p>1. The text is full of errors in the calculation of the results because the number of patients included in the study is 243, while the majority of infestation indices are calculated on a denominator of 245 (for example, Line 177: 38 + 207; all tables).</p> <p>2. There are no results presented on the distribution of the parasites found while they are being discussed (L309-L314).</p> <p>3. There is too much table of results. The data in Tables 1 to 4 should be summarized as population characteristics. For example, you have to give the sex ratio, the extremes of the ages and the average age, and so on.</p> <p>4. The variable "tribe" is not ethical because we cannot consider a tribe more parasitized than another. In addition, clinical variables such as "vomiting", "abdominal pain", etc. should in the end be studied according to the species otherwise it is established that it is known symptoms of intestinal parasitic infection.</p> <p>Some variables such as "Habit of eating hawk food" have no direct relationship with intestinal parasitic infection. Maybe it was necessary to replace it by "frequency of eating raw or undercooked".</p> <p>▪ The keyword</p> <p>- L31: "Patient" cannot be considered as a keyword</p> <p>▪ The introduction</p> <p>- L36: Put the letter "P" in "... countries Particularly ..." in lowercase</p>	<p>1. It was noted and correction was effected in line 177, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>2. It was noted and correction was effected in line 309-314, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>3. It was noted and correction was effected in table 1-4, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>4. It was noted and correction was effected in table 5, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>Keyword</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>- L42: Delete the bracket after "...in this age group [4])..."</p> <p>- L54: specify the objectives of the study at the end of the introduction.</p> <p>▪ Materials and Methods</p> <p>Summarize the subtitles because the numbering is too long.</p> <p>- L66: Correct "15°C and over 40°C" instead of "temperature ranges between 150°C and over 400°C"</p> <p>- L77: Correct the numeration 3.3.1 "3.3. Inclusion criteria"</p> <p>- L95: "q = complement of p (1-p)" Delete the "q" because there is not a q in the formula.</p> <p>- L122: 3.8.1 Macroscopy: the macroscopic aspects of 2 to 5 do not seem important.</p> <p>L142: Delete the repetition on bracket</p> <p>Results</p> <p>- all calculations must be verified to ensure that the base was 243 patients instead of 245</p> <p>- L173: Substitute "An overall prevalence of 29 subjects (12%) were found to be positive for intestinal parasitic infections." by "an overall prevalence of 12% were found corresponding to 29 subjects positive for intestinal parasitic infections."</p> <p>- L185: Replace "... was recorded among 116 (47.3%) students..." by "was recorded among students 116 (47.3%)". Likewise in L197: "highest among age range of 11-15 years (36.8%)."</p> <p>- L199: Delete the bracket on "(11.9%)"</p> <p>- Table 2: what's mean "Informal" Educational status? Better to combine them with the "none"</p> <p>There is no difference between the variables "Occupation" and "Monthly income"</p>	<p>-It was noted and correction was effected in line 31, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>The introduction</p> <p>- It was noted and correction was effected in line 36, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>- It was noted and correction was effected in line 42, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>- It was noted and correction was effected in line 54, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>Materials and Methods</p> <p>- Sumarises subtitles</p> <p>- It was noted and correction was effected in line 66, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>- It was noted and correction was effected in line 77, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>- It was noted and correction was effected in line 95, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>- It was noted and correction was effected in line 122, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>- It was noted and correction was effected in line 142, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>Results</p> <p>- It was noted and correction was effected in the resultss, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>-</p> <p>- It was noted and correction was effected in line 173, under results, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>- It was noted and correction was effected in line 185, under results, in yellow</p>
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>- Table 5, 6 and 7: in the column 2, the total (N) must always be 29. This is not the case in “Tribe “, “Educational status”, “Type of toilet facility”; etc</p> <p>- L258: “Others = dam water” replace dam water in the table above</p> <p>▪ Discussion</p> <p>It is not very convenient to say by []. I recommend putting the name of the author if not to reformulate.</p> <p>- L290: “The lower prevalence might be due to improved environmental sanitation, better knowledge of personnel health and hygiene, economic and educational status of the subjects found in the study area.”</p> <p>This statement is contrary to the results of the study.</p> <p>- L293-L294: your results don’t corroborate this statement “males gender are more susceptible to infection” because 11.8% he is almost equal to 11.9%.</p> <p>- L303: However is not the right word of transition here. Likewise in L310 (...However Hookworm...).</p> <p>- L304: “This study contradicts the work of [29], who reported highest prevalence in the ages 9-10 years among children.” The is not a contadiction because 9-10 is included in 6-10.</p> <p>-L309: Replace “The most common intestinal parasitic infection identified” by “The most common intestinal parasite identified”</p> <p>▪ References</p> <p>- L408 and L414: Reference 34 is the same that the 3</p>	<p>colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>-- It was noted and correction was effected in line 199, under results, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>--- It was noted and correction was effected in table 2, under results, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>- It was noted and correction was effected in table 5,6 and 7, under results, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>- It was noted and correction was effected in line 258, under results, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>- It was noted and correction was effected in line 258, under results, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>- It was noted and correction was effected in line 290, under results, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>-- It was noted and correction was effected in line 293-294, under results, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>--- It was noted and correction was effected in line 303-310, under results, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>---- It was noted and correction was effected in line 304, under results, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>----- It was noted and correction was effected in line 309, under results, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p> <p>References</p> <p>- It was noted and correction was effected in line 408-414, under results, in yellow colour as suggested by the reviewer</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		