



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Parasitology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_46697
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Prevalence of Nematode Parasites in Sheep and Goat at Eastern Hararghe Administrative zone, Haramaya Woreda of Six Kebeles and Haramaya University Shoat Farm</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original research article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The title of the manuscript is very confusing; assuming that the name of one of the farms where the study was conducted is 'Haramaya Woreda of Six Kebeles', I see no other reference to this 'name' in the paper.</li> <li>• Layout of the manuscript is too narrow.</li> <li>• Abstract layout is not the same as per the latest version of this journal; there are no key words.</li> <li>• Referencing style used is completely different from that used by the journal.</li> <li>• The level of English is sub-standard; the manuscript needs to go through English language editing.</li> <li>• There's no heading for introduction.</li> <li>• References used are very old and too few; most of them are from non-peer reviewed sources.</li> <li>• Introduction is unnecessarily long and does not clearly show the current gaps in knowledge which this study is trying to address. The purpose of the study is therefore unclear.</li> <li>• Most of references cited in the text do not appear under the reference section.</li> <li>• Methodology and selection of study subjects is unclear; how many flocks were involved in this study? How many animals were selected in each flocks and how?</li> <li>• It seems to me that, maybe, a software was used to translate this manuscript into English language, and unfortunately, the outcome was a complete disaster.</li> <li>• The results are unclear and the layout is very distorted; it's therefore hard to make head or tail of what is going on.</li> <li>• The English in this manuscript is so bad that it's hard follow</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Alaster Samkange</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Namibia, Namibia</b>