

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_76575
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the Diagnostic Utility of geohelminths from environmental and stool samples in Nnewi metropolis
Type of the 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

[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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First, I suggest changing the article's title, because it is indeed identifying the prevalence of geohelminths in children, and not evaluating the utility of the diagnostic of these parasites. 2. In the Introduction part, you could give more information about studies performed around the world on this theme: what is known about geohelminths in China, India, Mexico, Brazil, Ethiopia, for example? What are the techniques/methods used in these countries to identify these species? How is the epidemiology rated? 3. How dangerous can these parasites be for human beings? 4. You did not mention the country where the state is located, I think this information is worth mentioning. 5. On the Study Design, you say that the study was performed in children aged 6-13, but, on the Discussion, you say that it was performed only on the children aged 11-13. Can you please clarify and adjust it? 6. Feecal Collection [5] and Laboratory Analysis of Soil Sample [6]. These are titles and thus, should not contain references, but only in their description on the text (I have mentioned it on my notes to the text). 7. Results - I think that the best way to show them is to first write about them and then summarize the information in a table just below the referred text and not the other way around. I also think that how the parasites are distributed according to the children ages/age group and if they were dewormed could be better explained/clarified. You could also refer, if possible, the stage of these parasites. On the table1, on the frequency, can you please say the total from each of the numbers of parasites identified? 8. On the Discussion, you have the chance to give more information. You may need to first compare the results with the international results, then with the results in developing countries, after that with those found in Africa and finally with results in your country. The discussion was performed only locally. You never discuss the age factor, or if you did, it was superficially, you can improve it! On the tables 2 and 3, you presented Pearson tests and P values, but during the discussion you never mentioned what is the meaning of these results. You did not say if the prevalence of the simultaneous prevalence of two species was normal for other studies or if different, what was the difference and what you think can be the relation between them, despite the fact they belong to the same group. Did you identify, in your study, children with signs of infection with one of the parasites that infects the skin? Finally, what are your recommendations for further studies on this area? Or even for the children relatives and schools? 	

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Please pay a special attention for the entire document writing. There are some gaps in the middle of the text on results that probably are not necessary and the space between words.	
Optional/General comments	The article is interesting and could have a bigger impact on readers if you give it a wide improvement.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Salamandane Silva Macaringue</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal</i>