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In the revised version of the Ms concerning the prevalence of intestinal parasitic infections in Jiangsu province in Eastern China, certain aspects have been changed. However, there are still some considerations the authors should take into account.

It does not seem adequate to provide reference 21 to justify the use of a transparent tap test to look for Enterobius vermicularis. Actually, the reference seems a little absurd as the host concerned is an Aotus monkey. It would be more preferable to put as reference WHO (1991) or even Ash et al. (1994).

The authors say that there was "no significant difference in the rate of infection between participants from rural sites and those from urban sites......". This comment is rather surprising as in urban sites (n=12,423 individuals) protozoan infections had not been looked for, something that was done only in rural sites. Moreover, it seems unacceptable that out of a total of 30,153 subjects, or perhaps only in rural sites (n=17,730 individuals), only a single case of Blastocystis was found but not any other protozoan species. This is really unbelievable as this does not happen in any developed country. Also, keeping this in mind, the title of the Ms should really be "The prevalence of intestinal HELMINTH infections, with special reference to Clonorchis sinensis."
Even more surprising is the fact that more than 93.58% of the questionnaires of rural sites were valid. More than 90% of the individuals practiced hygienic-sanitary habits that are absolutely adequate: washing hands, not drinking unboiled water, not using fresh feces for fertilizer (although they should defecate in latrines!). These questionnaires turn out to be rather surprising. Moreover, 26.6% walk barefoot to their workplace in the fields. These questionnaires seem to have been made by trained people with the aim of obtaining results that do not adjust to reality.

The fact that treatment was carried out with Albendazole and Mebendazole would change the STH profile - a very relevant factor as the species treated are intestinal parasites with a much higher prevalence (from 4.2% to 54.5%). On the other hand, nothing is mentioned about treatment with Metronidazole, a drug of particular relevance to treat protozoans; and this is very surprising indeed as among the total of individuals analyzed (n = 30,153), there was only a single case of Blastocystiasis.
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