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Reviewer’s report:

There are quite a few studies published in recent years addressing the importance of factors such as knowledge, attributes and practices (KAP), as well as perceptions and beliefs for prevention and control programs of schistosomiasis. These studies were undertaken in different settings, different countries and using different approaches. Therefore a systematic review aiming to summarize and compare the results of these different studies is highly relevant and of importance and could be indeed informative for optimising on-going treatment and control programs. Therefore the aim of the study is certainly valid. However in the current version of the manuscript, the result section is kept rather vague and common mainly summarizing the literature, but providing little in-depth, detailed analyses. For instance authors do not compare directly studies from different countries or if different approaches (e.g. community versus school based studies) provide different results. Are there differences in terms of misconception or knowledge in different parts of Sub-Saharan Africa? At the beginning of the discussion in line 189-191 the authors actually exactly raise this point, but it has not really directly been addressed/discussed in the presented review.

One conclusion authors emphasize (line 227/228) is that "uneducated women are more vulnerable due to their daily water related house chores coupled by poor knowledge...". This point has only been shortly raised in the results (line 143/144) referring to several references. This is one example for which authors could provide more details and compare included studies in detail to justify their conclusion.

Addressing such questions more specifically would add a lot to the value of the manuscript. Many of the included studies are quantitative, which should allow some comparisons of the different studies.

Furthermore there are some additional points (below), which should be addressed as well. The manuscript as it stand is not yet suitable for publication and the authors should improve the manuscript.

- Author's evaluated eligibility of studies included into the systematic literature review, but not really the validity of data. Are the data of included studies obtained in an appropriate way? Are they conclusive? Is there a risk of bias within and across studies? Critically addressing these points is of major importance.
- In this context, I suggest authors not only provide the PRISMA flow diagram but also the PRISMA checklist, which contains these points, too.

- Authors should discuss potential limitations of the presented literature review.

- Abstract-Conclusions: authors state here that 'The findings are useful for treatment in particular targeting pre-school children'. Just reading the abstract, it is unclear if and why authors specifically look at pre-school children. And it sounds like, it is only useful for targeting pre-school children. However the systematic review was not primarily looking at pre-school children.

- Sub-Saharan Africa is written in different ways: sub Saharan, Sub-saharan, Sub-Saharan. Please keep consistent throughout the manuscript. There are other inconsistencies such as: pre-school/preschool children or care givers/caregivers.

- Introduction: S. japonicum is not anymore as widespread as the other two species. Please be more precise.

- Introduction: In line 85 authors introduce 'SEED' in the context of integrated control strategies. Looking at reference 19 and other literature, SEED seems to be a tool in family planning. Authors should explain in more detail the importance of SEED for disease management and what they actually mean in the presented context.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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