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Reviewer's report:

i still think the test does stretches the conclusions. the abstract which will be the most read section of the paper concludes: "These results suggest that an anthelmintic intervention may not have a direct impact on malaria infection."
this sentence is misleading repeated helminth treatment versus single treatment should be clearly stated.

the begining of the discussion also does not make it very clear that we are talking about 2 different anthelmintic regimens and not treated versus not treated "Results of the current study suggest that the anthelmintic intervention (treatment with PZQ and ALB four times a year) did not have any impact on malaria infection (prevalence, malaria parasite density and frequency of malaria attacks) as no differences were observed between children in the anthelmintic intervention group compared to children in the control group."

again the conclusion starts "In conclusion, findings of the current study show that in areas co-endemic for malaria and helminth infections, an antihelmintic intervention may not have a direct impact on malaria infection (prevalence, parasite density and frequency of malaria attacks)."
again this paper is comparing 2 anthelmintics regimens not treated versus not treated it should be expressed explicitly.
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