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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Abstract: fifth sentence - Schistosoma not written in full for the first time; hematobium written instead of 'haematobium' & used instead of 'and'

2. Throughout manuscript – more up-to-date and at times, relevant, references must be used

3. Throughout manuscript – inconsistent and incorrect referencing style(s) e.g. Background, first sentence (1&2) and then third sentence 3

4. Throughout manuscript – substandard use of English language and grammar e.g. Background, third paragraph, sentences one and two

5. Methods: first paragraph – there is no explanation of what ‘localities’ are, how they are related to States i.e. a subdivision or just places; how were these localities selected?

6. Methods: poor organisation of the methods chosen and unclear explanations of methods i.e. why was the calculated sample sized doubled to account for design effect, non-response and missing data?; how did the authors determine in what way the calculated sample size be sampled from the schools, admin units and locality?; were localities chosen based on prior knowledge of reported schistosomiasis cases?

7. Methods: There should be a subheading for ‘Statistical Analysis’

8. Methods and Results: There are inconsistencies between the methods and results; the statistical tests used are not necessarily appropriate and have not been justified by the authors; the results do not correspond with the methods of analysis described.

9. Methods: There is no description of what is contained in the questionnaire and how it was developed and what it’s purpose was.

10. Methods: the ethical statement is not sufficient i.e. where were the records stored and confidentiality?

11. Results: this section is not written well with poor scientific writing and
presentation of the results. As mentioned previously I not confident that the correct analysis was carried out. In addition there are correlation statistics mixed in with descriptive statistics i.e. results are not reported sequentially.

12. Discussion: This is not a strong discussion and does not show a good review of existing literature to support of contrast the author’s findings.

13. Conclusion: There are some incorrect statements and assertions i.e. second sentence – ‘The burden on school children is more compared to the rest of the population’ – but in this study only the school children were tested and according to a previous statement by the authors this is the first study on schistosomiasis to be done in this state.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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