International Journal of Infection
Volume 9 · Issue 3 · e123721

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Prevalence of Intestinal Parasitic Infection and Associated Risk Factors Among Primary School-Aged Children (5 - 15 years) in Southern Nigeria

Joan Gbonhinbor, Austin E Abah, Grace Awi-Waadu

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
28 Feb 2022	3 Aug 2022	13 Aug 2022	10.5812/iji-123721

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 5
Authors' reply to reviewers 6
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 **Revision 2** Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 10

1 Original submission

4 comments · 15 Mar 2022 – 12 Jun 2022

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 15 Mar 2022

Dear AE
Greetings and Regards
Thank you so much for choosing me as the Reviewer of this manuscript
The following comments include:
1- The title of the manuscript should be corrected in terms of the population and at what time.
For example, write a cross-sectional study of the prevalence of intestinal parasites and related risk factors in primary school children (Southern Nigeria)
2-In line 11, parasitology techniques should be mentioned in parentheses, for example (direct smear - concentration with ethereal formalin, etc ...
3 -In line 10, what statistical software was used to ANOVA test on the types and what version?
4- Correct line 12: Turkey Honest Significant Difference test
5-Line 22 Significant difference with what variable is obtained ?
6-In keywords, the word Nigeria should replace the word Bayelsa State
7-Line 63: It is better to specify the study areas on the geographical map
8- There is no diagram in the manuscript, and it is better to delete Table 3 and replace the diagram
9- line 130: prevalence ....?
10- Table 1: Parasitic species in rows and study areas in columns
11-In Table 2, instead of NE and NI, positive samples and percentages should be stated in parentheses
12-In the discussion, the present study should be compared with other studies
13-In conclusion, the strengths and weaknesses of the study and suggestions should be stated

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 3 Jun 2022

Dear AE
Recommended comments include:

1. Add "prevalence" in the title of the article.
2. Add the age group in the title of the article.
3. Add statistical testing in the methods and materials.
4. Determine the age group in the Sample collection.
5. Correct the beginning of the discussion.
6. Discuss risk factors in the discussion

Best regards.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 12 Jun 2022

Dear EIC
Please ask the author to correct the following comments.
Reviewer 1:

3. Add statistical testing in the methods and materials.
4. Determine the age group in the Sample collection.
5. Correct the beginning of the discussion.
6 . Discuss risk factors in the discussion

Reviewer 2:
1- The title of the manuscript should be corrected in terms of the population and at what time.
For example, write a cross-sectional study of the prevalence of intestinal parasites and related risk factors in primary school children (Southern Nigeria)
2-In line 11, parasitology techniques should be mentioned in parentheses, for example (direct smear - concentration with ethereal formalin, etc ...
3 -In line 10, what statistical software was used to ANOVA test on the types and what version?
4- Correct line 12: Turkey Honest Significant Difference test
5-Line 22 Significant difference with what variable is obtained ?
6-In keywords, the word Nigeria should replace the word Bayelsa State
7-Line 63: It is better to specify the study areas on the geographical map
8- There is no diagram in the manuscript, and it is better to delete Table 3 and replace the diagram
9- line 130: prevalence ....?
10- Table 1: Parasitic species in rows and study areas in columns
11-In Table 2, instead of NE and NI, positive samples and percentages should be stated in parentheses
12-In the discussion, the present study should be compared with other studies
13-In conclusion, the strengths and weaknesses of the study and suggestions should be stated

Best regards

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 12 Jun 2022

Dear Author
Please revise the manuscript based on the following comments.
Reviewer 1:
1. Add "prevalence" in the title of the article.
2. Add the age group in the title of the article.
3. Add statistical testing in the methods and materials.
4. Determine the age group in the Sample collection.
5. Correct the beginning of the discussion.
6 . Discuss risk factors in the discussion

Reviewer 2:
1- The title of the manuscript should be corrected in terms of the population and at what time.
For example, write a cross-sectional study of the prevalence of intestinal parasites and related risk factors in primary school children (Southern Nigeria)
2-In line 11, parasitology techniques should be mentioned in parentheses, for example (direct smear - concentration with ethereal formalin, etc ...
3 -In line 10, what statistical software was used to ANOVA test on the types and what version?
4- Correct line 12: Turkey Honest Significant Difference test
5-Line 22 Significant difference with what variable is obtained ?
6-In keywords, the word Nigeria should replace the word Bayelsa State

9- line 130: prevalence ....?
10- Table 1: Parasitic species in rows and study areas in columns
11-In Table 2, instead of NE and NI, positive samples and percentages should be stated in parentheses
12-In the discussion, the present study should be compared with other studies
13-In conclusion, the strengths and weaknesses of the study and suggestions should be stated
best regards
EIC
Dr. Hamidreza Kouhpayeh

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reply to the Reviewer’s query

Reviewer 1:

1. Add "prevalence" in the title of article.
2. Add age group in the title of article.
3.Add statistical testing in the methods and materials .
4.Determine age group in the Sample collection.
5.Correct the beginning of the discussion.
6.Discuss about risk factors in the discussion

Response

1. Prevalence added.
2. Age added
3. Statistical testing method added.
4. Age group is determined.
5. Beginning of discussion corrected.
6. Risk factors discussed.

1- The title of the manuscript should be corrected in terms of population and at what time?
For example, write a cross-sectional study of the prevalence of intestinal parasites and related risk factors in primary school children (Southern Nigeria)
2-In line 11, parasitology techniques should be mentioned in parentheses, for example (direct smear - concentration with ethereal formalin, etc ...
3 -In line 10, what statistical software was used to ANOVA test the types and what version?
4- Correct line 12 :Turkey Honest Significant Difference test
5-Line 22 Significant difference with what variable is obtained?
6-In keywords, the word Nigeria should replace the word Bayelsa State
7-Line 63 It is better to specify the study areas on the geographical map
8- There is no diagram in the manuscript and it is better to delete Table 3 and replace the diagram
9- line 130 : prevalence ....?
10- Table 1: Parasitic species in rows and study areas in columns
11-In Table 2, instead of NE and NI , positive sample and percentages should be stated in parentheses
12-In the discussion, the present study should be compared with other studies
13-In conclusion, the strengths and weaknesses of the study and suggestions should be stated

Response

1. Title corrected**.**
2. Parasitology techniques mentioned.
3.Version stated.
4. line 12 corrected to Turkey Honest Significant Difference test
5.variable stated.
6. Bayelsa replaced with Nigeria
7. The coordinates is the preference of the authors.
8. The author preferred the use of the table.
9. corrected.
10 and 11. These are prerogatives of authors so long as the table conveys the information to the audience.
12. Discussion is compared with other studies.
13. Conclusion written accordingly.

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

2 Revision 1

4 comments · 21 Jul 2022 – 30 Jul 2022

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 21 Jul 2022

Dear AE
Greetings and Regards
Thank you for choosing me to review the manuscript
According to the corrections made, this manuscript is acceptable and worth publishing
thanks

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 27 Jul 2022

Dear AE

The Discussion section needs revision.
This section is just compared with other articles.
It needs more interpretation and analysis.
Best regards

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 30 Jul 2022

Dear EIC
Please ask the author to correct the following comments.
The Discussion section needs revision.
This section is just compared with other articles.
It needs more interpretation and analysis.
Best regards.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 30 Jul 2022

Dear Author
Please consider all comments in the manuscript.

The Discussion section needs revision.
This section is just compared with other articles.
It needs more interpretation and analysis.
Best regards
EIC
Dr. Hamidreza Kouhpayeh

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reply to reviewer’s comment.

Associate Editor 1:
Dear Author

The Discussion section needs revision .This section, just compared with other articles. It needs to be more interpretation and analysis

The discussion section has been revised and highlighted

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 12 Aug 2022 – 13 Aug 2022

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 12 Aug 2022

Dear AE
Overall, this is a clear, concise, and well-written manuscript.
Best regards.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 13 Aug 2022

Dear EIC

Based on reviewers' opinions, this manuscript has been accepted for publication in the International Journal of Infection.
Best regards.

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 13 Aug 2022

Dear Author
Congratulations
Hereby, we announce that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in the International Journal of Infection. The manuscript will be available online in future issues.
Wish you all the best
EIC
Dr. Hamidreza Kouhpayeh