



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_49853
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of monoclonal antibody (IgG2bMAb) for detection of coproantigen from experimentally infected rats with Strongyloides ratti
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment: In your research topic, Area of study is not mentioned. The accepted way to write 'Strongyloides ratti' is in italics; or write and underline separately the genus and species names	Thank you for this observation, but however due to the nature of our research, mentioning the study area in the topic does not seem to be important since our study is not a case study and it does not tend to predict a trend or incidence of diseases in a particular area. It focused in developing and evaluating an effective diagnostic method. Thank you, we have corrected this in manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: is written as a single block of text; there should be no sub-topics. Recommendation (at least one) was not given, it is mandatory to give at least one major recommendation in your Abstract 40C – please learn how to write 40°C. Applied to other sections of your write up. Make an insertion of the degree symbol from menu bar please. Et al., is written correctly as <i>et al.</i> , please. (in italics when typed).	Thank you for this suggestion regarding the abstract. But the abstract was written based on format (sub topics) giving by journal in their websites. We agree with this comment, we have included a recommendation to abstracts section. Noted, we have incorporated this correction throughout the manuscript
Optional/General comments	Standardisation is American English. Are you referring to 'standardization'?	Yes, we mean 'standardization' we have corrected this throughout the manuscript

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)	There are no any ethical issues in this research