



Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_48211
Title of the Manuscript:	Nematode Parasites of Anurans from Three Cocoa farms in Ondo State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>)

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)
--	---------------------------	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1.Needs to update literature as 2010 is the most recent. THERE are many recent pubs in Nig on amphibians.</p> <p>2. Follow journal guidelines foe citation and listing of references</p> <p>3. Sample size is too small [37 Or 38] for 3 farms. Then change the farm names and treat as stations. Approx. 12 per station. for 2 toads and at lease 7 frogs. So you had no replicate for some.</p> <p>4.A large chunk of the discussion is not related to the study. this could be corrected by relating observations to literature or their life cycle</p> <p>5.Delete Fig 1</p> <p>6. Add a Conclusion which should include the major findings of this research.</p>	<p>The literature is sufficient for the research. There may be <i>many</i> recent pubs in Nigeria on Amphibians but there is a dearth of information on parasites of Amphibians in Nigeria. This is what the research exposed as novel for Ondo state.</p> <p>noted</p> <p>Sample size followed ethical considerations as stated in the Ms, particularly for amphibians and their status in conservation as provided in the IUCN RED LIST.</p> <p>We maintain the relevance of discussion outside the life cycle discourse as it provided background information on the species and their distribution.</p> <p>We wish to include this pedigree if it is not a wrong information</p> <p>We shall do this as a separate section as advised.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Restructure abstract</p> <p>Introduction and results are too brief. The brevity of results makes it difficult to have a relative discussion</p>	<p>Comment noted but clarity in the present form is not ambiguous</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Discussion includes listings of where parasites were found without attempt at explaining similarities or differences</p> <p>There are claims of first observations. These will be valid when literature is updated</p>	<p>Similarities and differences are of taxonomic importance as espoused in the classification in Fig 1. The relevance of the biodiversity should not be lost on biology of the species</p> <p>We stand to be corrected if otherwise. Literature consulted are up to date and relevant enough. If perhaps an oversight, kindly re-direct.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	