

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_95813
Title of the Manuscript:	Coprospectical approach to assess the current epidemiology of bovine paramphistomiasis at Babuganj, Barishal district, Bangladesh
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://www.journalajravs.com/index.php/AJRAVS/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I could say that but unfortunately the study design and data are not clear. 2. The title of the article is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article was comprehensive and gave an over view about the general work and its results which needs critical revision. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, but also needs critical revision especially material and methods and results. 5. Yes, but it needs extra work to be suitable for publication. 6. The references are sufficient. 7. There are No ethical issues in this manuscript. 8. Serious Major revision will be needed. 9. Clinical signs? Didn't mentioned 10. Some comments added within the file. 11. Discussion should be checked after the required corrections. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The language/English quality of the article is not suitable for scholarly communications and need a careful revision.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amira Adel Taha Abdel Aleem AL-Hosary
Department, University & Country	Assiut University, Egypt