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Reviewer's report:

In this manuscript Angelo and colleagues analyze individuals' knowledge, perceptions and water contact practices associated with transmission of urinary schistosomiasis to complement chemotherapy as control strategy. The manuscript focuses on a topic of public health importance, however it presents major weaknesses that led this reviewer to not recommend it for publication.

Background

More data is needed to specify the prevalence of the disease in the country. The authors say that the "prevalence at national level continues to increase with time despite the commencement and expansion of the control strategies". This statement is not backed up by related data. It is important to include prevalence values for the understanding of the paper and clarification to the readers. In addition, it would be interesting to contextualize the increase in prevalence mentioned in the text. In general, we all know that schistosomiasis is a persistent and difficult disease to eliminate all over the world. Despite this difficulty, it has been observed a worldwide reduction in prevalence due to treatment and other control measures. Therefore, it is important to show the data related to the particular situation of Tanzania.

Methods

More information about the study site would be quite useful. For instance, the size of the community as well as number of schools, since part of the study population was of students.

Additional information on the study population is also necessary. It is not clear who were the community members stated on the paper. Were the parents of the school children considered as the community members group or were they included in a separate group? In the results section, the authors only mentioned the data from the school subjects and their parents. This made us wonder, once again, who the community members were. There is also a need to explain how the sample size was chosen for each group that participated in the SSI and FGD.
What was the rational behind the need to use two different strategies, ie, interviews and focus group discussion to collect data? How the authors select the participants for each data collection strategy, ie, interview and FGD? What was the criteria used for assigning participants for each group? There is a need to include a description of the questions and/or topics of the interview and FGD.

Results

The results did not show data compatible with 171 individuals that were individually interviewed or participated on the FGD. In the paper the authors showed only data from parents and school children. What about other community members? It would be nicer if the authors showed the differences and similarities of the two groups interviewed: parents and children. A similarity analysis would make the paper significantly more interesting and also could add information obtained in the study.

Discussion: There is a significant need of more discussion related to the data. The discussion section lacks more analysis and comparison with previously published papers and clear description of what the paper contribution really is, what was new and relevant.

References: High number of references with 10 years or more.
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