

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_92152
Title of the Manuscript:	DETECTION AND QUANTIFICATION OF GASTROINTESTINAL PARASITES AMONG INMATES OF SOCIAL WELFARE HOMES AND LOW SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREAS IN METROPOLITAN PORT HARCOURT
Type of the Article	cross-sectional survey

### **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:

(<https://www.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy> )

### **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	The article is well carried out, it is a survey on intestinal parasites among inmates of social welfare homes and low socio-economic areas in metropolitan port harcourt, they present associated factors, but when writing the discussion they confuse the reader since the figures they discuss are about the 119 positives and not all of the 1500, which makes it appear that there are more infections, in addition to the fact that there are no conclusions and recommendations for the prevention of these parasites in the social welfare homes	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Some conclusions would be interesting and not only the list of which and how many parasites, in addition to giving recommendations for the prevention of parasites in a type of guide or cleaning protocol, food handling, bathroom care, isolation of patients, case management chronic.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Although tables are presented, the type chosen is not very friendly to the reader, perhaps changing the format a little and making them more understandable would be good to improve the document	

### **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:	Ricardo Leon Sanchez Consuegra
Department, University & Country	Universidad Libre Seccional Barranquilla, Colombia