

Review of: "Giardia lamblia infection And Associated Risk Factors Among Patients Who Are Seeking Stool Examination At Bule Hora University Teaching Hospital, West Guji Zone, Ethiopia"

Tej Nath Nepal

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

It is a useful study both from a clinician and public health perspective.

In general, the paper is prepared well, and most of the presentations are specific. However, I provide my feedback or comments for further improvement.

Introduction

First line under introduction - strong statement and suggests reference here. (*Giardia lamblia*, a flagellate protozoan also known as *Giardia intestinalis*, is the most prevalent intestinal infection in the world).

First and third lines under introduction may be merged and written better with reference/s.

There is repetition of message or context under introduction. May be rewritten.

The following sentences appear strong and may need references. (Children under the age of five and schoolchildren account for the majority of prevalence rates in African nations. This shows that children's immune condition and ignorance of basic personal hygiene practices make them particularly vulnerable to *Giardia* infections. Giardiasis is understudied in Ethiopia, and a nationwide survey was carried out that specifically looked at *G. lamblia* among students and other people in 93 villages).

Methods

The percentage of the total patients who were subjected to stool sample examination may appear more scientific instead of the absolute figure in the following sentence- (The total number of patients sent for stool examinations at Bule Hora University Teaching Hospital last year was 2028.)

This sentence appears twice in a similar way under study population and inclusion/exclusion criteria. May be reviewed. (All randomly selected patients who came to the laboratory for stool examination during the data collection period were our study population.)

Stool sample collection procedure and explanation to patients may be written in detail because contamination of the sample may be overlooked. (Patients' stool samples were obtained using a standard laboratory service method of

collection.)

May need to specify source / modification for credibility in the following. (The tools were modified from related literature.)

May have to mention the EpiData owners. I think it is Odense, Denmark. Similarly for SPSS also.

Please check your English under Ethical Approval. May have to write the Ethical Approval number of your approving authority.

Results

There is some duplication of information in texts (sentences) and tables. May have to consider being precise in the write-up and avoid writing the information in sentences which can be accommodated in the tables.

Figure 1, Pie chart doesn't seem necessary as information seems displayed already even without showing the pie chart.

May have to re-check figures in the tables

May have to mention in the chart, figure titles as 15 February 2023 to 15 March 2023 instead of mentioning only Ethiopia, 2023

Discussion

This sentence may be written better for clarity. (In a similar vein, this study's prevalence was lower than that of a The true distinction may lie in the enhancement of the medical center's services and the demographics of the study population.)

Discussion part may need to be aligned with the title and objective of the study.

Comparisons may be made with similar socio-economic groups or countries because findings will be different if we compare with countries or regions with differences in socio-economic conditions.

Conclusion

Conclusion may be written better in line with objectives, results, and way forward or further scope for future researchers on the similar subject. Some sentences in the conclusion are not written in context with results and objectives.