



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_47752
Title of the Manuscript:	INVESTIGATION OF GASTROINTESTINAL PARASITES OF LOCAL CHICKENS (<i>Gallus domesticus</i>) IN UGEP, YAKURR LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA, CROSS RIVER STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>DECISION: ACCEPT WITH MINOR REVISION</p> <p>Title: Quite relevant and in conformation with the findings. Abstract: Very nicely constructed, however, the last three sentences (line 25-27) on conclusion may be removed. They are not based on the findings of this study. Introduction: Line 32-36 can be deleted, they are just a compilation of literature and not needed to introduce the topic. At the end of introduction the authors are advised to add a few lines on the objectives and hypothesis of their study. Materials and Methods: Which diagnostic method did they use to identify the intensity of infection? Floatation technique is more an accurate method for nematode eggs, which method did the authors followed for trematode and cestode parasitic eggs. Further, how did they identified the parasites at species level based on morphology or egg shapes only. Why not the authors did performed the larval culture to accurately diagnose the infection. Results and discussion: The tabular presentation of data is good. What reason the authors have for high prevalence of nematodes as compared to cestodes. Further, why Ascaridia galli is more prevalent only in their area of study (line 151-152) as compared to other nematodes. The authors have provided moist environmental factor as the reason, the same can be true for other nematodes too. Why cestodes are restricted to small intestine or duodenum only. Conclusion: It is too lengthy, it can be reduced to just five lines. Lines 174-178 may be deleted (It is a thing of worry.....chickens for food).</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract. Kato-Katz thick smear technique and Margolis et al., 1982 methods were used to identify the intensity of infection. Morphological image atlas of eggs was used for identification of cestodes and nematodes. 2. Introduction. Line 32 – 36 have been deleted. 3. Materials and methods. Kato-Katz thick smear and Margolis et al., 1982 methods were used for determination of intensity of infection. 4. Based on the morphological shape of cestode and nematode eggs, morphological atlas for these parasitic eggs was used for identification to species level. 5. Results and Discussion. The climatic and ecological host factors are responsible for the restriction of cestodes to the small intestine and duodenum of the digestive tract. 6. Conclusion. Lines 174 – 178 have been deleted as indicated by the yellow colour.
Optional/General comments	<p>This manuscript is one of a general kind of study on parasites of domestic chicken having adopted a standard parasitological technique to investigate the prevalence of parasites. Although it is not a novel study on avian helminth parasites but discusses important factors of parasite load in male and female Gallus with emphasis on some epidemiological variables like climate, etc. Therefore, it can be considered for publishing in the journal after minor revision as indicated above.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	