

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"

Kipcho Mukabane¹

¹ Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Title: *Giardia lamblia infection And Associated Risk Factors Among Patients Who Are Seeking Stool Examination At Bule Hora University Teaching Hospital, West Guji Zone, Ethiopia* Alqeer Aliyo Ali, Bule Hora University

Consider reducing the title length to 20 or fewer words: *Giardia lamblia infections and associated risk factors among patients seeking stool examination at Bule Hora University Teaching Hospital, West Ethiopia.*

Abstract

The rationale for conducting the study is not sound enough. Updating information available is not very "new" nor "novel."

Introduction

Putting words in brackets implies we can do away with them. The bracketed words are very crucial in the amplification of giardiasis. Remove the brackets.

Citations should be more than one for a paragraph and the most recent available.

Check spacing of words, abbreviations. Words like "anal oral" route should be "anal-oral."

Socioeconomic factors could be aggravating the situation. Does giardiasis occur in first-world countries/Ethiopian cities/slums? Give some comparative statistics to reinforce your argument.

The sentence starting "Although few studies" in the last paragraph in the introduction is not making scientific sense.

Methods

Give the geo-reference of Bule Hora University Teaching Hospital.

".....was found 467 kilometres" is grammatically wrong.

Justify the choice of the study site/study period.

Indicate the age range and sex of the study participants.

How were the study participants approached to participate in the study since the selection was random?

Tell us more about the fields the microscopy counted, how authenticity of the reading of the fields was maintained, how discordance in observation was handled, and how debris in the slides was excluded from the final data.

Do we still refer to it as SPSS?

The first sentence of ethical approval does not make scientific sense.

Results

Remove “see table” and let it be “table”

What do you mean by “The findings of this study are in line with”? You also went on to name a list of other studies, yet you called it “a study.”

In your title, you have given a zone in which the study was done, while in your results section you just give other studies without given zones either in Ethiopia or outside Ethiopia. Results of a study compare and contrast regions with similar/dissimilar settings e.g., “...studies conducted in Pakistan...”, is wrong. Give the region/hospital where it was done.

All the citations in the discussion where a number of findings are referred to must be listed appropriately at the end of the sentence.

When doing a discussion of a research:

- i. Give your key findings in order based on the objective of the study,
- ii. Tell us the implications of the findings,
- iii. Give supporting findings in the similar region in the country of study, other regions in the country of study, region/continent, and globally,
- iv. Give contradicting findings, and
- v. Suggest likely reasons confounding the findings.
- vi. Avoid a case of plagiarism or legal action by giving all citations in order of recency.

Conclusion

Should be “Conclusion and Recommendations.”

Author contributions

What for, yet the document has only one author?

Other references

What for?

Generally

Check spacing between words.

Use a grammar checker to re-align the grammar of your sentences.

Put citations at the end of a couple of sentences to reduce breakages during reading/review.

Put several citations within the same brackets.

Expound on your discussion section.