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REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: Urinary schistosomiasis is a neglected tropical disease with a high burden in Tanzania. Despite the implementation of preventive chemotherapy through the use of Praziquantel to treat endemic communities either through school-based or community based in Tanzania, the prevalence of this disease has remained high due to rapid reinfection. This calls for other measures to complement chemotherapy, such as behavioral change intervention and improvement in water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) resources. Therefore, this study is very important as it provides Schistosomiasis control program managers with information on the knowledge, attitude and practices (KAP) in the studied district necessary for the designing and implementation of behavioral change intervention.

Therefore the objectives, study design, execution and intrepetation of the results are commendable. The use of semi-structured interviews (SSI) and focal group discussion (FGD) from adults and school children for the KAP are standard methodologies in social science studies.

The authors have done well in providing qualitative data on KAP in the study area. However, the non-presenting of quantitative data, collected from SSI, makes it difficult to evaluate if the findings of the study are significant or not. Besides, the study was more FGD dependent, whereas FDG is a tool to compliment SSI

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

The design of the study is faulty, because the authors conducted only 28 and 20 Semi Structured Interview (SSI) with parents and school children. Was there any sample size determination? The small size of the SSI makes is difficult to generalize the research findings as a true representative of the study population with any statistical analysis. This I did not see in the manuscript
The non-quantification of the responses from SSI in the form of tables, and descriptive statistics makes it difficult to appreciate why the authors conducted SSI if the first place. The two tables included in the manuscripts are general information tables and does not include any real results as expected. There are no tables the on KAP responses of participants either in SSI or FGD for comparison among the study groups. Instead, the results section is filled with FGD quotes.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

The authors should provide justification for the small number of SSI. The authors should use tables to compare and analysis the responses from SSI.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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:
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