

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_111053
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Urinary Schistosomiasis in West Africa: A systematic Review and Meta-analysis
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

Review Form 1.7

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, this manuscript is important for scientific community in giving insight about data collected during several years in this part of Africa.</p> <p>2. May be more details/clarification need to be added (Prevalence of Urinary Schistosomiasis in 8 out of 16 West Africa countries from the 80's following 20 years of MDA)</p> <p>3. Yes the abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>4. Yes subsection and structure of the manuscripts are appropriate</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct even if minor modifications were needed</p>	<p>2. We acknowledge the suggestions made by the reviewer concerning our choice of the study title. However, we find it challenging to adopt the proposed revision for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. The reviewer's advice suggests that our study exclusively focused on 8 out of the 16 West African countries. This, however, is not accurate, as our investigation covered articles from all 16 West African countries. If certain countries are not represented in our study, it is because articles from these countries did not meet our inclusion criteria.</p> <p>ii. Furthermore, our study did not specifically delve into treatment regimens employed over the years to combat the infection. Consequently, our review concentrated solely on the prevalence of the infection and its trend over the considered period, without focusing on treatment strategies such as Mass Drug Administration (MDA). As a result, rephrasing the title to capture prevalence relative to MDA will be misleading.</p> <p>Upon further consideration however, we have revised the title from the current form to “Prevalence and trend of Urinary Schistosomiasis in West Africa: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis”</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Minor revision needed but English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments n	Additional references from studies in NIGER suitable to be added (please search references by Amadou GARBA Djrmay as author, actually Responsible at WHO Office)	<p>We express gratitude for the reviewer's insightful comments and the thoroughness applied to our review process. It caught our attention that none of the articles from a notable contributor, Amadou Garba, who has authored over 160 research articles in the field, were included in our study.</p> <p>Upon re-evaluating our search strategies throughout the study, we observed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Our search strategy effectively retrieved a substantial number of articles authored by Amadou Garba.ii. However, during the meticulous screening process, all studies from Amadou Garba were excluded at various stages. <p>Nevertheless, we have integrated reference information from some of his articles into our revised manuscript.</p>

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	