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Cover letter

To: BMC public health editorial office

Subject: MS 7883754668031755, Prevalence of intestinal parasitic infections and risk factors among schoolchildren at the University of Gondar Community School, Northwest Ethiopia: a crosssectional study

Dear editors and reviewers of BMC public health, we the authors of the manuscript really appreciate your valuable comments, criticism and suggestions. By now, our manuscript is very much improved and easily to understand. Comments and suggestion about the revised manuscript are also well taken and addressed. The manuscript is again revised in the light of the reviewers comment. The point-by-point response, correction and additional information regarding language correction are listed below.

With best regards

Aschalew Gelaw

Corresponding author
Point by point response

Title: Prevalence of intestinal parasitic infections and risk factors among Schoolchildren in the University of Gondar community school, Northwest Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study

Date: February 6 / 2013

Reviewer: Peter Steinmann

Dear reviewer, thanks very much for your encouragement regarding the improvements observed in the revised manuscript. As per your comment, the manuscript was given to a local language editor who is fluent in English. This editor had given as some corrections and assured the appropriateness of the language used after the third revision for easily reading and understanding of the paper.

Regarding the style, we carefully followed the author’s guideline and used other published articles in the journal as template. Additional material was also attached
Point by point response to the concerns

Title: Prevalence of intestinal parasitic infections and risk factors among schoolchildren in the University of Gondar community school, Northwest Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study

Date: February 8/2013

Reviewer: Yvonne Ai Lian Lim

Thanks very match for the invaluable and constrictive comments that helped us to improve our manuscript.

Major compulsory revision

1. Did the authors attempt to do a multivariate analysis as well? Were the results Non-significant?

   • Yes, we did. Variable that appeared to be not associated with the outcome variable during bivariate analysis was taken in to multivariate logistic regression for further analysis. In multivariate analysis, it was found that none of the observed risk factors was statistically associated with parasitic infection.

Minor essential revisions

2. On page 4, last paragraph, change "foots" to "feet".

   • It is well taken and corrected as indicated

3. On page 8, paragraph 2, change "likely hood" to "likelihood".

   • It is well taken and corrected as per your comment

Point by point response

Title: Prevalence of intestinal parasitic infections and risk factors among Schoolchildren in the University of Gondar community school, Northwest Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study

Date: February 8/2013

Reviewer: Oystein Haarklau Johansen
Dear reviewer, Thanks for considering the effort we made to improve the manuscript in terms of language, clarity, taxonomy and the additional works. Although we noticed it after your invaluable comments, there were transcriptional errors during constricting table 4 (particularly writing the numeric and percentages). Thanks a lot it was invisible for us

Major compulsory revisions

1. There is a numerical error in table 4 risk factor "Swimming habit". I suspect the number 256 should be replaced with 156.
   - Sure, it was an error and corrected as per the comment given

2. One of the main conclusions in the study is that lack of hand washing seems to be a risk factor for parasitic infection. By looking at the numbers, the statistics do not seem right. By confidence interval analysis I cannot find a significant difference between the proportions of 33.8% and 34.4%, yet a p-value of 0.007 is listed. I am not a statistician but to me it seems either the numbers that the p-value is based on are wrong or the statistical tests are wrong.
   - As I have mentioned above there was transcriptional error in writing the frequencies after referring the analysis output the numbers were wrong. Hence corrected, however there was no mistake in the P value.

3. I also question the stated lack of association between means of transportation and parasitic infection, the difference seems significant to me.
   - There was also similar mistake in this variable. As you, suspect there was statistical significant association with this variable. As a result, it is corrected.

4. I see no other choice than to recommend a compulsory review by a statistician before this is published, as I have tried to crack the numbers to the best of my ability.
As we observed frequent problems in table four we consult a statistician who did the original analysis, to be frank there was no mistake there. All the mistakes were introduced during constricting the table. Thanks a lot, we corrected ourselves now.

5. After the data tables and statistics have been reviewed, results sections, abstract, discussion and conclusions might need to be changed accordingly.

• According to the changes obtained after revision correction were made in the result, abstract, discussion and conclusion part of the document. Please refer the revised manuscript for confirmation.
Language corrections made

As we tried to explain in the point-by-point response to the concerns, a language editor in our university saw the manuscript and the following comments were given.

Title
- in the university is changed to at the University

Abstract
- **Background:** line one page 2, among major was corrected as among the major. In the fourth line, the word strategies was changed to measures.
- **Method:** line four page 2, stool specimens, prefix the collected was added
- **Result:** line three parasites were was corrected as parasite was
- **Conclusion:** line 2, proportion is corrected as prevalence

Background
- Paragraph one line two, the statement, they are major public health problem was corrected as parasites are major public health problems.
- on same paragraph line four, the word achievement in was changed as performance of
- Paragraph 2 line 8, hookworm was changed as hookworm infection
- Reference number on paragraph 3 line 4, (9-11) was corrected as [9-11]
- Paragraph 3 line 4 was also taken corrected as were undertaken.
- paragraph 3 line 9, finding was changed to findings

Methods
- Under the subtitle of Data collection and laboratory processing
  - Paragraph on line 2 Mesert elementary school was corrected to Mesert Elementary School
  - Paragraph 2 line 3 --- was changed to A portion each of the stool samples
  - Paragraph 2 line 5 emulsified was changed to preserved
  - Paragraph 2 line 6 research laboratory was changed to Research Laboratory (capitalized)

Result
• Under the subtitle of Socio demographic characteristics
  o Paragraph 1 line 2 was changed to production of insufficient specimens

Discussion
  o Paragraph 2 line 1 and 2 Mesert elementary school was corrected with reports of other similar studies
  o Paragraph 2 line 3 lake Langano was corrected with Lake Langano
  o Paragraph 5 line 6 relation was corrected with association

Conclusion
  o Paragraph 1 line 1 intestinal parasitoses was corrected as intestinal parasites