

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_96208
Title of the Manuscript:	Trypanosomiasis in rodents from selected plague endemic foci of Tanzania; the concealed public health threat.
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:

(<https://journalsajp.com/index.php/SAJP/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The document expresses content of interest in the areas of zoonoses, public health and parasitology in an endemic area of the Trypanosomiasis problem.</p> <p>2. It is recommended that it only remain as follows: Trypanosomiasis in rodents from selected plague endemic foci of Tanzania.</p> <p>3. It is suggested to improve the writing of the summary, the method used in the laboratory is needed to determine the parasitism in the captured animals</p> <p>4. They seem adequate; however, it is recommended to review, since they place more emphasis on some sections, so it is necessary to review the objectives so that methodologically in the results and discussion sections the "expected results" are described.</p> <p>5. The manuscript presents form and consistency, except that it is necessary to review and improve the writing, as well as the style, grammar and syntax.</p> <p>6. The references do correspond and support the manuscript, however it must be reviewed because some with errors (writing) are observed, in some data is missing (for example, the number of pages) (and in the manuscript, review the order or placement sequence, as well as the style or form)</p> <p>It is recommended to review the writing of the manuscript, and give order and sequence to what is proposed as an objective; also avoid redundant information.</p> <p>Errors were highlighted on the manuscript so that the authors can identify and correct.</p> <p>References are sufficient; however, they must be written taking care of the style/form (according to the guidelines suggested by the journal), both in each of the paragraphs they support, and at the end of the list of references.</p> <p>It is important to consider the guidelines of writing - editing that gives the journal, and as an example the following conditions can be applied at work:</p> <p>This predominance of <i>A. lumbricoides</i> than any other GIPs agreed with some other reports [23,15]. On the other hand, da Silva et al. [19], Khanal et al. [2] and Hernández et al. [25] found <i>T. trichiura</i> predominant</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	It is recommended to review the writing, since grammatical and syntax errors were detected	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Errors were highlighted on the manuscript so that the authors can identify and correct	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Benjamin Valladares Carranza
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of The State of Mexico, Mexico