

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_101168
Title of the Manuscript:	Gastrointestinal parasites and relationship with Faecal IgA and Cortisol in farmed rabbits in Bamenda, North West, Cameroon
Type of the Article	Original 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Dear Editor South Asian Journal of Parasitology On reviewing Ms_SAJP_101168, it could be stated that it may be publishable after providing these major concerns.</p> <p>1- The language of the manuscript is poor, particularly in discussion. Please improve the language editing. Several mistakes have been found. e.g. "as well as in animals with co-infection with..." should be "as well as in animals co-infected with...", also "defense mechanism" not "defence mechanism". Take care throughout.</p> <p>2- Please provide details about source (s) of rabbit sampling. Did authors obtain 130 rabbits during 3 months only? Please explain.</p> <p>3- Great scientific mistakes have to be avoided throughout e.g. spp. NOT spp. Coccidia are members of family Eimeridae, so, authors have to mention: <i>Eimeria</i> spp. or coccidia NOT Coccidia spp. The term spp. means more than one species, when authors mention one species, please use sp. NOT spp., and vice versa. Please consider it throughout.</p> <p>4- The use of normal symbols is NOT recommended in the text. In abstract + Please replace with and</p> <p>5- Please avoid repeated citations with the same references in the same paragraph (e.g. in the introduction).</p> <p>6- Scientific names (parasites, plants, animals, bacteria, fungi, algeetc) should be italicized. e.g. in Tchoffo et al. (2020)</p> <p>7- References are NOT cited properly. e.g. Lebas and Colin (2000) in ref list and mentioned Lebas et al. (2020) in the introduction, Tanjung and Rangkuti (2019) or Tanjung et al. (2019) . Write carefully throughout. Also, and or & ????</p> <p>8- Some cited references are missed in the reference list. e.g. Rautureau et al., (2010), Ilić et al. (2018), fikru et al. (2006)</p> <p>9- □ ??? in materials and methods. Write °C</p> <p>10- Authors wrote The study was carried out in the Northwest region of Cameroon located between latitudes 50 55' N and 60 30'N and Longitudes 100 25'E and 100 67'E (Ndenecho, 2005). What did the citation mean here?</p> <p>11- write Ilić et al., 2011; Ilić et al., 2014 as follows: Ilić et al., 2011, 2014</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<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)
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Khaled Mohamed El-Dakhly
Department, University & Country	Beni-Suef University, Egypt