



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_46805
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiological Survey on Gastrointestinal Parasitic Zoonosis in Cattle of Sirajganj District, Bangladesh
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>)



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	This manuscript reports experiments that successfully induced the gastrointestinal parasitic zoonosis in cattle of Sirajganj District, Bangladesh. The study adds to a slowly increasing body of work by other groups that have shown interesting in Asian livestock. While the experiments and analysis of results appear to have been well done, the text of the paper does not accurately acknowledge, describe or discuss some of the studies previously reported. These, and other inaccuracies, have been noted in minor review.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract separate objective and material and methods. Richer material and methods.</p> <p>Line 6-8 Provide a reference for the final sentence. Line 4 They were cholormformed... explain the euthanasia method more clearly and attach the ethics committee protocol number.</p> <p>Keywords alphabetical order ... Sirajganj District...</p> <p>Introduction reorganize the numbering of all references in the text data on the country's cattle herd size and numbers about economic importance Line 12 ...<i>Fasciola gigantica</i>... Line 23 FAO [1962] ... very old reference, replace.</p> <p>Methodology Line 1 ...Microbiology and Parasitology Department...</p> <p>Study area Describe the Köppen climatic classification and local flora</p> <p>Study period Line 4 ...study. Coproscopy...</p> <p>Study population were the animals chosen from a farm or several farms? Clarify. Attach the ethics committee protocol number. Describe the age, sex, body condition, breed, level of husbandry of cattle, and history of previous use of anthelmintic. Line 4 ...150 cattles... Line 6 ...anthelmintic was...</p> <p>Sample collection and preservation Line 5 ... examination. About...</p> <p>Identification of parasites Line 2<i>Fasciola</i> spp</p> <p>2.5.2</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 1 ...50ml water was...</p> <p>Results</p> <p>Line 2 “Wright, 1879. A total...”</p> <p>2.6</p> <p>Change paragraph formatting</p> <p>Results and Discussion</p> <p>separate scientific names from parasites. Example: Lines 4-8 ... <i>Fasciola gigantica</i>(16.66%), <i>Schistosoma indicum</i>(6%), nematodes including <i>Trichostrongylus axei</i>(4.66%), <i>Strongyloides papillosus</i>(2.66%), <i>Trichuris spp</i> (3.33%) and protozoa including <i>Balantidium coli</i> (7.33%) and <i>Giardia sp</i> (4%). From this study, it was observed that the prevalence of <i>Fasciola gigantica</i>(16.66%) was the highest whereas <i>Strongyloide papillosus</i>(2.66%) infections were the lowest (Table 1).</p> <p>Table 1 organize results in prevalence order</p> <p>Figure 3-9 Align and format the same size figures</p> <p>The results were well analyzed, however, it is still necessary to mention the importance of the results for the animals health and zoonoses risks.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Line 1-4 delete from text “Parasitism is one of the major problems affecting health and productivity of livestock. By fecal sample examination, an overall 27.33% gastrointestinal parasitic infection was detected that has also zoonotic in cattle at Ullahpara and Shahjadpurupazila, Sirajganj district, Bangladesh. There was a wide variety of parasites with most animals having multiple parasite infections”.</p> <p>References</p> <p>3. A. D. B. (1984). ADB production year book. Volume-25.</p> <p>check correct in site.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lew Kan Sprenger
Department, University & Country	Faculdade uniguaçu, Brazil