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### Compulsory REVISION comments

This is an interesting article because amoebiasis is an infection responsible for a great morbidity and even sometimes of mortality especially in the disadvantaged countries. However I have a few remarks which, taken into account could improve the quality of this article.

- First I will start with the title, which could be limited to "Prevalence of Amoebiasis among School Children in Makurdi Metropolis, Benue State, Nigeria" because no criterion among the predisposing factors was taken into account in the recruitment of the study population. Besides in the methodology part, the authors have to define what was the study population.

- Then, in the methodology and laboratory part, it is necessary to revise this part. 1) The technique of concentration by formaldehyde destroys the trophozoites therefore it could give results only for the cysts. 2) A cyst can not allow the identification of *Entamoeba histolytica* because the cyst of *E. dispar* also has the same characteristics. Therefore it is imperative to carry out a fresh state where it was necessary to look for haematophagous trophozoites that are the only elements that can affirm the species *E. histolytica*. The authors cite the Cheesbrough manual as a reference for identification, but it is necessary to go further to describe the keys to the manuals that made it possible to identify.

- Finally, what the authors call a prevalence concerning the distribution of the infestation according to the variables (age, sex, water sources, ...), is not a prevalence but an index of infestation. And this does not reflect the real results since it is sometimes obvious that depending on the variables studied, when population is important, the rate of infestation will be important. For prevalence's according to the variables (age, sex, etc.), the 32 positive cases should be taken and the sex, age, ... of the 32 patients should be divided accordingly. This is why, in Tables 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, the percentages are not 100%.

### Minor REVISION comments

#### Introduction

- Paragraph 1 Line 1 (P1-L1): "It was estimated that diarrhea accounted for 9-9%" replace the dot (9-9%) in below.

- At P1-L2 and in all the text: "Infections with amoebiasis" is a repetition, substitute by "infection with *E. histolytica* or amoebiasis only".

- P3-L2: remove the underlining in "malaise"

- P2-P3: The authors say on the one hand that amoebiasis is favored by certain factors and on the other hand that it is higher in the children then it finally associate these factors with children to better justify the choice of the study population.

- P3-last line "The laboratory diagnosis of amoebiasis ... direct wet mount [8]" add the only methods that differentiate *E. histolytica* only causative agent of amoebiasis.
* Methodology
- In such studies, it is now preferable to replace the title “Méthodology” by “Patients and method”
- Combine the parts 2.3 and 2.4 and remove the number of male and female, which constitute results.
- For the spelling of p-value, write the p in lowercase

* Results
- Start by giving the characteristics of the study population, which will enable us to verify the statistical calculations. Moreover, I did not find any significance of the prevalence according to age group.
- As I have pointed out above, the percentage totals according to sex and age must always be 100%, and for this purpose it is necessary to consider the 32 positive and to distribute them according to the age, sex, ...

* Discussion
- By [10], by [11] or [12] reported is incorrect, you must cite the authors. For example, Nyanke et al, [10]... or Aribodor et al, reported [12].
- P2-L1L2: “children had a higher prevalence 14.13%” put 14.13% in bracket or add prevalence with 14.13%
- Delete the last “study” in “The study revealed that male children were found to influence amoebiasis in this study”.
- P4-L4L5: Verify the compared values after the change in only the 32 positive cases in “The result is in conformity with [12] who reported that males were more infected with a prevalence of 16.1% than females who had a prevalence of 9.3%.” Put the “i” in uppercase in “it also agrees...”
- P6-L1L2: “Water supply is an important risk factor for several outbreaks have resulted from the contamination of water supplies with Entamoeba histolytica cysts and trophozoites” The cysts are the only resistance and dissemination forms of E. histolytica not the trophozoites.
- You don’t discuss the parents’ occupation results.???

* Conclusion
- You cite the toilet in this part when they were not part of the factors studied.

* References
- In the references, put a dot between the authors and the titles.
- [13] and [19], limit the authors at 6 and add and al.
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