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Thank you for consideration of our manuscript for publication in your journal. We have reviewed the manuscript according to your reviewer's comments.

**Reviewer's report**

Title: Assessment of the prevalence of intestinal parasitosis and associated risk factors among primary school children in Chencha town, southern Ethiopia.

Version: 2 Date: 29 October 2013

Reviewer 1: Lorenza Putignani

Reviewer's report

General

The manuscript is an interesting issue regarding the prevalence of intestinal parasitosis amongst children in Southern Ethiopia. It deserves publication because the analysis of parasitosis prevalence in African reservoirs is still based on only few studies. But, a detailed revision of the English language is necessary before publication.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing plural words, punctuation, writing styles, the wrong use of tenses, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. Title: it was ok to read. No correction has been made except “The associated” changed to “associated”

2. Abstract:
   a. Background: second line, there was semi colons and plural word missing. This has been changed and corrected.
   b. Methods: there was no problem.
   c. Results: Last statement has been changed to clear and transfer the message. We have clarified this in the result section of the abstract accordingly.
   d. Conclusion: No Change made as based on the result.

3. Introduction:

   No significant change has been made in the revision of language.

4. Methods:
   a. Name of one of the school has been changed from the Amharic language “Chencha Mulu Andega” to English. “Chencha full primary school”.

5. Results: Missing commas, brackets, and tenses have revised to correct the language in this section.
6. Discussion: No significant change has been made in the revision of language. However; few missed plural words have corrected. Generally, based on the reviewer’s comment and English language professional language revisions have been made for all sections of the manuscript.

**Discretionary Revisions** (which the author can choose to ignore)

None

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I have no competing interest in relation to the current paper.

**Reviewer 2:** Gordon Nichols

**Reviewer’s report**

General

Assessment of the prevalence of intestinal parasitosis and the associated risk factors among primary school children in Chencha town, Southern Ethiopia. This is a study of the fecal parasite burden of children in a school in Ethiopia. Although such studies are relatively common in the literature, there is some merit in publishing details of the risk factors, even if the overall messages offer little that is new to science, because this might encourage control measures in Ethiopia and improve people’s lives.

1. **Title:** It was ok to read. Thus change has not been made for title.
   
2. **Abstract**
   
   c. **Results:** Last sentence, as indicated by the reviewer toilet ownership and using soap were not statistically significant as risk factors. Therefore, the result revised and change has been made totally.

   The Presence of Intestinal parasitic infections (IPIs) have statistically significant association with the educational status of the household heads, absence of washing facility, home cleanliness condition and type of latrine used with \( p < 0.05 \).
d. Conclusion: It is changed as the reviewer indicated.

The high prevalence of parasitic infections in these populations of children indicates that the protozoa and helminthes concerned are very common in the environment of these villages and the results of the risk factors analysis suggests that transmission is from several routes.

3. Introduction:

a. There were missing references (page 3 para 1 sentence 1; Para 2 sentence 1). We have now included these references in both paragraphs in the background section as the reviewer indicated.

4. Methods:

a. Methods: The parasitological methods do not include Cryptosporidium and as a result no cases were identified. The study research team is presumably unable to go back to the samples in this study and test. However, it is important to mention this in the limitations of the study in the discussion. The study did not differentiate the pathogenic *E. histolytica* from the enteric commensal *E. dispar*. This also needs to be included as a limitation. Otherwise the methods seem robust although the statistical analysis could be described a bit more clearly.

Therefore, the following statements now appear in the discussion of the paper as follows. As a limitation of this study, identification of Cryptosporidium cases and the pathogenic *E.histolytica* from the enteric commensals *E.dispar* were not differentiated due to lack of laboratory facilities in the department.

b. The potential risk factors are a bit limited. Factors that might also contribute to parasite infection are water storage in the house, involvement of children in food preparation, secure food storage, use of human fecal waste in agriculture.

Therefore, as the reviewer indicated this also included in the discussion of the paper as follows; although the potential risk factors for high burden of the disease were considered, a few risk factors were not evaluated in the current study.

c. Ethical considerations: The paragraph here seems to imply that the review of ethics was done after the study was completed. The sentence has been changed in the manuscript and appears as follows: The college research review committee revised the proposal according.............

5. Results:

a. The description of the results needs to be either significant or not significant. In Table 4 the significant odds ratios are wrong. Thus under Education in Table 4 “Unable to read and write” 104/122; OR 2.98 (CI 1.36-6.53) and “only read and write” 70/79; OR 4.01 (CI 1.6-10.07) are significant, whereas “Primary to
secondary" 119/152; OR 1.86 (CI 0.91-3.89) is not significant. The same applies for the rest of table 4 and the implications need to follow in the result descriptions and discussion.

The sentence in the text has been changed as follows: Household heads who were unable to read and write and also only those who read and write had the risk of their children to acquire the intestinal parasitic infection than household heads who had higher educational level with statistically significant difference (p<0.05). In addition, this part has been changed in Table 4 as the reviewer indicated.

B. In table 4 as reviewer indicated separating water supply into pipe water and non-pipe water shows piped supplies are significantly protective 234/302 (77.5%) vrs 90/98 (91%) OR 0.34 (CI 0.13-0.74) using Chi2 test. This part has been corrected as follows: Using pipe water source was more protective from IPIs than those who used stream and bono water source (0.34; 95% CI 0.13 to 0.74).

Generally, all results were analyzed with statistician to improve the paper.

**Discretionary Revisions** (which the author can choose to ignore)

None

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I have no scientific or financial competing interests in relation to this paper.