Journal of Advanced Immunopharmacology
Volume 2 · Issue 1 · e118034
OPEN PEER REVIEW

Vanishing Schistosomiasis Endemicity in North of Khuzestan Province, Iran: A Twenty-Five-Year Assessment

Behzad Jafarinia, Roya Rashti, Leila Mohebbi, Javad Moazen, Elham Kord

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
19 Jul 2021	28 May 2022	28 May 2022	10.5812/tms-118034

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 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 Revision 2 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 10
4 Revision 3 11
Authors' reply to reviewers 12
Reviewer and editor comments 15
5 Revision 4 16
Authors' reply to reviewers 17
Reviewer and editor comments 18

1 Original submission

1 comment · 19 Jul 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 19 Jul 2021

Hello
Please send the full article with references.

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.

Reviewer 1:
Dear Sir,
Thank you for Submitting your Manuscript to Trends in Medical Sciences.
I have decided that your manuscript does not meet our criteria for publication and therefore must be Rejected.
Specifically:
1. The Names of Microorganisms should be written Scientifically and in Italics type, This is one of the simplest and most basic elements in writing scientific texts. Unfortunately, it seems that Researchers do not have the necessary and sufficient expertise in writing such a manuscript.

Thanks for your comments. The name of the disease and the genus of the parasite were edited and highlighted throughout the article.
2. The manuscript has several flaws including Objective errors in Methodology, interpretation of results and Discussion.
3. Lack of Updated References.

Thanks. some references were updated and edited.
I am Sorry That I Cannote be more Positive on this Occasion, but hope that you appreciate the reasons for this decision.
Best Regards,

Reviewer 2:
Hello
Please send the full article with references

Reviewer 3:
This manuscript has dealt with the situation of schistosomiasis in Khuzestan for 25 years. There are several weaknesses:
1-The name of the disease should not be used instead of the name of the genus of parasite.
2. Lowercase letters must be used to write the species name. In all cases.

Thanks for your comments. The name of the disease and the genus of the parasite were edited and highlighted throughout the article.
5. Discussion section, the authors should explain the reason of the infection in older people.

Thanks for your consideration. Explanations about the increase in the disease in the older people were added to the discussion and highlighted.

6. The author also points to the effective factor of agricultural activities on

increasing the incidence of schistosomiasis in the discussion without further explanation to clarify the declining trend in these 25 years.

Thanks for your consideration. Explanations about the agricultural activities were added to the discussion and highlighted.
7. Given the important issue of round-trip travel to neighboring countries, Iraq, and the possibility of contamination, the author needs to address this issue in the discussion.
Thanks for your consideration. Explanations about issue of round-trip travel to neighboring countries, Iraq, and the possibility of contamination were added to the discussion and highlighted.

8. Culture, people's habits, type of water resources, industrial and traditional farming systems and other aspects can also be considered in the author's discussion and analysis.

Thanks for your consideration. It was added to the discussion and highlighted.

9. References need to be edited.
Thanks. Some references were updated and edited.

Reviewer 4:
the paper has good information however, need to be more align and put it down in a better way guidelines, accordingly.
Thanks. The manuscript was edited and highlighted.

Reviewer 5:
The author has dealt with the situation of schistosomiasis in Khuzestan for 25 - years and points to its disappearance. This manuscript has several weaknesses, which are announced as follows:
1-Sometimes the name of the disease is used instead of the name of the genus of parasite.
2. Schistosoma haematobium is correct.

3. Lowercase letters must be used to write the species name. In all cases, the author has used capital letters when writing the names of species that need to be corrected.

Thanks for your comments. The name of the disease and the genus of the parasite were edited and highlighted throughout the article.
4. It is suggested to refer to the two published articles written by the following authors in the text:

Haghighi Leila (Urology case reports J 2020) and Nourian Alireza (Iranian J Parasitol 2020).
5. In the discussion, the authors point out that the same number of less reported cases, unlike in the past, has been in older people. However, in their justification they did not explain why the infection in older people.

Thanks for your consideration. Explanations about the increase in the disease in the older people were added to the discussion and highlighted.

6. The author also points to the effective factor of agricultural activities on increasing the incidence of schistosomiasis in the discussion without further explanation to clarify the declining trend in these 25 years.

Thanks for your consideration. Explanations about the agricultural activities were added to the discussion and highlighted.

7. Given the important issue of round-trip travel to neighboring countries, Iraq, and the possibility of contamination, the author needs to address this issue in the discussion.

Thanks for your consideration. Explanations about issue of round-trip travel to neighboring countries, Iraq, and the possibility of contamination were added to the discussion and highlighted.

8. Culture, people's habits, type of water resources, industrial and traditional farming systems and other aspects can also be considered in the author's discussion and analysis.

Thanks for your consideration. It was added to the discussion and highlighted.

9. References need to be edited.

Thanks. some references were updated and edited.

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

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.

The authors did not provide a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments in this round.

3 Revision 2

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

4

Revision 3

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.

Dear chief-in-Editor:
Professor Sheikhi
The journal of Trends in Medical Sciences
Thanks for the comments. The article was edited and the comments were answered as follows:

1- Importantly, I would say that manuscript should be edit grammatically by an English editor.
Response: writing level of the article (Full text) improved and edited.

2- In abstract part, using the infection in parentheses in line 2 is redundancy. (and in line 38)
Response: thanks. Edited.

3- In method of abstract part, why did the author use twice five in different form (five 5-year periods)? (in line 15, 88)
Response: thanks. Edited.

4- Of note, it is of great importance that abstract part appeared in different cite to be fluent without any grammatically errors affected on comprehension of the readers.

5- In introduction part, the genus of *schistosoma* is written completely, because it used for first place in this text. (in line 42, 43)
Response: the genus of schistosoma is written completely in the first use. As follows:
schistosoma (S). guineensis

6- In most places, the genus and species need to be corrected in this way *Bulinus truncates (B. truncatus*) (in line 53)
Response: thanks. Edited.

7- In the start of sentence, writing the number such as" 800 " in introduction section is not grammatically correct and it should be written in letters. (eight hundred)
Response: thanks. Edited.

8- In introduction part, in first place Praziquantel (PZQ) is written correctly, please use the abbreviation form (PZQ) in other sentences. Please apply writing principles in whole manuscript.
Response: thanks. Edited.

9- In introduction part, along with the "World Health Organization" should be used abbreviation form in parentheses (WHO) and similar the above comment, abbreviation form is written in next ones.
Response: thanks. Edited.

10-As far as, the cercaria of *Schistosomia* infects a person through skin penetration, not by drinking water; do you have any reference for this? (in line 62)
Response: We have referred to the reference of this line. **Reference No. 7** as follows:

World Health Organization. Schistosomiasis. Available at: http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs115/en/. 2021.
In the part of "**Prevention and control**" is written:
"The control of schistosomiasis is based on large-scale treatment of at-risk population groups, access to safe water, improved sanitation, hygiene education, and snail control."

11-In M&M section, "confirmed cases" must be written instead of "confirm cases".
Response: thanks. Edited.

12-In result section, the authors mentioned the statistic of the vanished infection is up to 2017. Regarding that we are in 2022, what is the reason for this?
Response: thank you for your attention. 2017 changed to 2022, fig 2 and it's caption changed as well.
In fact, data was available until 2017 at the time of writing the article, But now it has been updated.

13-In result section, It has mentioned to table 2,3,4 in which there is only table 1 in text.
Response: thank you for your consideration. The article has 1 table and 4 figures. The reference to the table and figures edited.

14- It is suggested that genus and species are written completely in first place in this way *Schistosoma haematobium (S. haematobium)* and it is rather to write the genus and species in this form *S. haematobium (Italic)* in all parts main text, figures and tables… (in line239,241,301,307,314,…)
Response: thanks. All of them Edited.

15- line 241 to 246 in discussion part are repeated according to above paragraph (line 233 to 238).It is suggested that line 241 to line 246 are deleted. Besides, in repetitive paragraph, there are not references 41,42 in reference section!!
Response: Lines 241 to 246 as well as lines related to references 41 and 42 were deleted.

16- In line, discussion part there is a typist error. (schistosomasis hematobium) please, recheck and rewrite this line. You mean schistosomiasis or *schistosoma haematobium*? (in line 247)
Response: thanks. Edited.

17- In conclusion part, Schistosomiasis means that the disease caused by *Schistosoma* parasites, so needless to write **Schistosomiasis disease** again. (in line265)
Response: thanks. Edited.

18- To the my knowledge, according to table 1 when the number of analyzed population is less than one hundred, we are not permitted to report the result in percent (%).
Response: In the percentage report, the range of numbers should not necessarily be zero to one hundred.

19- The reference style should be arranged again.

Response: The reference style arranged via EndNote.

4 Revision 3

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

5

Revision 4

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.

Dear chief-in-Editor:
Professor Sheikhi
The journal of Trends in Medical Sciences
Thanks for the comments. The article was edited and the comments were answered as follows:

1- I guess some of the sentences of the manuscript are not grammatically correct.
Response: writing level of the article (Full text) improved and edited and was marked with a yellow highlight.

2- As far as, the cercaria of *Schistosomia* infects a person through skin penetration, not by drinking water; in this reference is mentioned “safe water”, no safe drinking water! It means prevention is by avoidance of water sources containing cercariae that penetrate the skin, no by drinking water.
Response: It was change to "accessing safe water" and was marked with a green highlight.

3- To the my knowledge, according to table 1 when the number of analyzed population is less than one hundred, we are not permitted to report the result in percent (%).
Response: the percentages deleted in the table 1 and was marked with a green highlight.

4- The references style should be arranged again.
Response: The reference style is arranged.

Associate Editor 1:
1- In line 126 of the text "five 5-year" must be revised.

Response: thanks. It edited.

2- In lines 244, 297, and 303 the word "hematobium" must be correctly written.
Response: thanks. It edited. It changed to *"haematobium*".

3- In the keywords section at least 3 words must be written.
Response: 3 keywords were written.

5 Revision 4

0 comments

No public comments in this round.