



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_50954
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and Associated Risk Factors of Soil-Transmitted Helminthiases among Primary School-going Children in Rarieda, Siaya County-Kenya
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<p><b>Abstract:</b> line 6-remove s, remove and bracket as shown Line 11 why not say primary school children? Leave "going" 14,15 delete appropriately Line 21: go straight and state your findings Line 23-24 check the grammar ie "higher than" Summarize your abstract thus: brief introduction, objectives, methodology, results and conclusion. Line 27 key words are too many. Reduce to 7 eg prevalence, STH, primary school children, Kenya</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> Line 35 delete Line 39 remove "the" and put all parasitological names in italics Line 46 use "inclusive" instead Line 51 delete 57 use rectal prolapsed 58 do you mean chronic intestinal blood loss? 60 check the grammar 67,70 delete appropriately 82-85 These are not necessary. remove This introduction is too detailed and boring. Summarize</p> <p><b>Methodology</b> Line 87 Separate study population and study area 98 delete Separate study design from sample collection Line 100 why not say " this was a descriptive cross-sectional study" 101 delete 105 check tense 111-112 confusing. Check grammar 121 delete 123 go straight and state the statistical method used</p> <p><b>Results</b> 133 Separate results from discussion 135 delete 144 what do you mean? 153, 159 delete 176 this table is confusing. Be explicit 206 Go straight and discuss. Leave sub-headings 207 Rephrase. Why not say " out of 300 pupils tested for STH , 82 (27.3%) were positive" 208 Mind your comparism ie "higher" 211 use agrees with 217 This should not be part of discussion 222 Say "As far as" 225 Bracket, higher than 229 ,233 correct appropriately 236 Review this grammar and sharpen it 238 use "barefooted" 239 Review this grammar. Eg" Due to the type of soil in the area" 266,267 delete appropriately 269 remove sub-headings from discussion 278 This should come under results 288 do you mean defecaete?</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	296 "barefooted? 298 what is this? 310 Figures should be part of results. You can cite them while discussing 315 Review this sentence or completely remove it 327 Ethical approval should be part of materials and methods and not part of discussion	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Be concise	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b><u>Reviewer's comment</u></b>	<b><u>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)</u></b>
<b><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></b>	<b><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></b>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Solomon N. Ukibe</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Technology, Nigeria</b>