

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | South Asian Journal of Parasitology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_SAJP_95663 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | A SURVEY OF GASTROINTESTINAL HELMINTH PARASITES AND HAEMOPARASITES OF TILAPIA ZILLI IN ANAMBRA EAST LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF ANAMBRA STATE |
| 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:

(<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>The manuscript is important for scientific community</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>The abstract of the article comprehensive but I suggest that the objective of the work be said at the beginning.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are sufficient. I propose, if possible, that they be updated further (mainly from the last five years)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I suggest that you consider including the scientific names of parasites of the sites as Key words. - A good taxonomic keys are used for the identification of the specimens obtained; It would have been to get to the species taxon and not just the genus. - I think it is more correct that the tables should be mentioned in the text after the presentation of these. - The conclusion may be shorter, briefly noting the results. | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Yes</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>It's interesting and well-conducted research.</p> | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Jesús G. Rodríguez Diego |
| Department, University & Country | Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, México |