



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_66843
Title of the Manuscript:	DETECTION OF B1 GENE IN TOXOPLASMOSIS USING PCR AMONG PREGNANT WOMEN ATTENDING ANTENATAL CLINIC IN KADUNA STATE NORTHWEST NIGERIA.
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/journal/10/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This paper evaluated infection of women with <i>Toxoplasma</i> during pregnancy, by using serological and molecular methods. The study design and methodology are good, but should be better presented and better interpreted. Main points and suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The results section should include a text summarizing the results, and not only give the raw data in figures and tables. 2) The authors describe giving out questioners and collecting much data. This data should be analysed to evaluate risk factors significantly associated with infection. 3) The discussion should interpret the results, and not repeat the introduction. The justification of the choice of PCR assay should be included in the introduction or in the methods section. Here, the authors may highlight the advantage of nPCR (since all samples were also positive when only the external primers were used. The discussion should state how the results of this study contribute to the understanding of toxoplasmosis in Nigeria and recommend future prospects for investigation, prevention or treatment. 4) The reference list should be corrected with proper citations from the text. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The introduction may be shortened. 2) The M&M section could be more concise and with less sub-sections. 3) Statistical analysis should be more detailed, and methods should be described in the M&M section. 4) The Results section should be written as text. 5) PCR results should always include positive and negative controls. 6) The discussion should be re-written. 7) The reference list should be revised and consistent with one style (for example, journal names should either be abbreviated or given in full for all references). 8) Some of the references in the list do not seem to match their citations in the text, for example, the sentence referring to transmission via cat feces cites two papers regarding sheep, while the sentence describing environmental transmission cites a paper on food borne pathogens... 9) Minor language and styling corrections are added in "track changes" to the manuscript text. 	
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> The authors provide an ethical approval documentation and state that all participants consented to their inclusion in this study.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sharon Tirosh-Levy
Department, University & Country	The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel