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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback*(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This study provides valuable epidemiological insights into the age-dependent prevalence of Loa loa infection in an endemic region. By analyzing both microfilaremia and IgG4 markers, the research contributes to a better understanding of infection dynamics, potential genetic influences on parasitological status, and the role of host immunity in Loa loa infections. These findings could inform targeted intervention strategies and enhance the effectiveness of diagnostic approaches for loiasis. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title accurately reflects the content of the study. However, for clarity and brevity, a refined version could be:**"Age-Dependent Prevalence of Loa loa Infection: Microfilaremia and IgG4 as Diagnostic Markers."**This removes redundancy while maintaining precision. |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract is informative but lacks a clearly structured summary. Consider including:* **Background**: Why is the study important?
* **Objectives**: What is the main aim?
* **Methods**: Key methodologies (e.g., study population, diagnostic techniques).
* **Results**: Highlight main findings with statistical significance.
* **Conclusion**: Relevance of findings and future implications.

**Suggested Improvements:*** The abstract should emphasize the significance of IgG4 detection as a supplementary diagnostic marker.
* Explicitly mention the statistical significance (p-values) for key findings.
* The conclusion should highlight the potential genetic influence on infection status.
 |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | The study is scientifically sound, and the methodologies used are appropriate for assessing *Loa loa* prevalence. However:* The study mentions "possible genetic factors" influencing microfilaremia status but does not provide direct genetic analysis. If genetic factors are only hypothesized, this should be explicitly stated.
* The discussion should further clarify the potential role of immune response in the persistence of amicrofilaremic status.
 |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** |  The references are mostly relevant and well-cited. Some references are outdated (e.g., sources from the 1980s and 1990s). Consider adding recent studies on Loa loa epidemiology, diagnostic advancements, and genetic influences. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? |  The manuscript is understandable but contains grammatical and syntactical errors. Some sentences are lengthy and complex, requiring restructuring for better readability.**Examples of grammatical errors:*** "Loiasis is cause by the human filarial Loa loa which is endemic..." → "Loiasis is caused by the human filarial parasite Loa loa, which is endemic..."
* "The treatment available (diethylcarbamazine citrate and Ivermectine) are mostly active..." → "The available treatments (diethylcarbamazine citrate and ivermectin) are primarily active..."

 Proofreading by a professional editor or language review tool is recommended. |  |
| Optional/Generalcomments | **Statistical Analysis:*** The statistical tests used (Chi-square, Fisher’s test) are appropriate but should be better justified in the methods.
* Consider adding confidence intervals for key results where applicable.

**Strengths:**Valuable epidemiological insights on *Loa loa*Well-defined study design and statistical analysisRelevant discussion on age-dependent prevalence**Areas for Improvement:**Improve language clarity and grammarStrengthen the abstract and discussionUpdate references with recent literatureBefore acceptance, the manuscript should undergo major revision to address language issues, enhance clarity, and provide stronger discussions on genetic influences, and public health implications. |  |
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