

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_86145
Title of the Manuscript:	Health threats of residents living close to household refuse collection points in Mfoundi Division, Centre Region, Cameroon
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: (<https://www.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The "result" section of the abstract says the patients aged 1–60 years were enrolled, while the "methods" in the main body mention different age range.</p> <p>I personally suggest not specifically mentioning the name of the organization (HYSACAM). Someone may indirectly infer that this organization is solely responsible for disseminating the pathogens in the study area.</p> <p>In the last sentence of the first paragraph of 'Analysis of Risk Factors', the authors write "while hand washing or not after emptying waste has little influence on the risk of pathogen contamination" but later in the "discussion," they say "Also, individuals under the age of 20 were the most infested. Generally, children under 20 years are mostly the ones who empty domestic waste irrespective of sex, what could highly expose them frequently at unsanitary environments and consequently being more exposed to high risk of contamination" Is not this contradictory?</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The "aims" section of the abstract does not explicitly mention the aim of this study.</p> <p>In 'result' section of the abstract, the authors write, "209 (82.9%) individuals were infected with at least one species of parasite with 19 (7.8%) having single infestation and 209 (82.9%) multiple infestation." 209 of 209 had multiple infestations and 19 had single?</p> <p>In the "result" of the main body, the authors write: "Similar occurrence trend was observed in Mbankolo for <i>A. lumbricoides</i> (16.6 %), <i>T. trichiura</i> (9.5 %), hookworms (16.6 %) and <i>E. histolytica</i>/<i>E. dispar</i> (19.0 %) same as in Carrière for <i>E. coli</i> (15.7 %) and <i>Candida</i> spp. (74.5 %)." Can it be rephrased in a clearer way?</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Please refer to the manuscript for other minor comments.	

### 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anil Pokhrel
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Nepal