



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_38885
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence And Risk Factors Of Intestinal Parasitic infections Among Inmates Of The New-Bell Central Prison, Cameroon
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Abstract:</b> Please write the full name of the parasites (genus and species) when you mention them for the first time. i.e. <i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i> and not <i>A. lumbricoides</i>.</li> <li><i>Blastocystis</i> should be named <i>Blastocystis</i> spp. and not <i>Blastocystis hominis</i>, as no molecular studies have been performed, only microscopic examinations.</li> <li><b>Material and methods. Data collection.</b> "to provide a thumb-sized fresh stool sample early in the following day morning. Stool containing containers were collected before 10 am and the fresh faecal samples ..."It is recommended to analyse multiple serial stool samples in order to obtain reliable results. One of the main causes of the low prevalence of parasite infection is the inadequate collection of faecal specimens. <b>The stool samples should not be tested only once.</b> If a serial stool collection cannot be performed, then the authors should briefly explain why.</li> <li><b>Results.</b> Overall prevalence. In the text appears 38.2%, whereas in the tables appears 39.3%. The same holds good with the prevalence of protozoa and helminths infections: 35.6% and 43.3%, respectively. These figures are different in the tables. i.e. protozoa 24.6% and helminths 16.6%.</li> <li>How come inmates who had spent <b>less than one year</b> in prison had the highest infection prevalence, than those who spent <b>more than 10 years</b> in prison (taking into account the overcrowding, the lack of potable water supply and sanitation access all through those years of imprisonment?</li> <li><b>Handwashing practices.</b> There is a <b>higher prevalence in inmates who systematically wash hands... than those who did not.</b> How do the authors then explain the infection by <i>A. lumbricoides</i>, with a higher prevalence among those inmates who did not systematically wash hands before eating?</li> <li><b>Lines 183-184.</b> "<i>E.coli</i> and <i>A.lumbricoides</i> infections were most prevalent among inmates who drank <b>exclusively</b> mineral water." Was it bottled mineral water? How can the authors explain these facts?</li> <li><b>Line 223.</b>"The overall IPIs prevalence in New-Bell central prison was lower than reports from Nigerian prisons namely the Keffi prison in 2006 [7], the Owerri prison [8], as well as the Ouagadougou prison in Burkina-Faso [6] and the Shewa Robit prison in Ethiopia [11] where IPIs prevalence was always over 70%. " In order to compare data with another papers, the sample collection and concentration procedures should be the same.</li> <li><b>Chilomastix mesnili.</b> It is considered non-pathogenic by the CDC. It is considered an indicator of fecal contamination of food or water source. It was found associated, but not the cause of parasitic infections. Do the authors have any sound reference of <i>Chilomastix mesnili</i> as a known pathogenic organism?</li> </ol>	4
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	-----	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Compulsory corrections should be done by the authors before acceptance and approval of the manuscript for publication.	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Claudia Irene Menghi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Buenos Aires, Argentina</b>