

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Pathogen Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPR_97312</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Cryptosporidiosis and Associated Risk Factors Among Children Attending Paediatric Hospitals in Enugu Metropolis, Enugu State, Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalijpr.com/index.php/IJPR/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1-yes</p> <p>2-fine</p> <p>3-could be modified as below</p> <p>4-would expand the conclusions</p> <p>5-yes</p> <p>6-yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes and only suggest minor revisions needed	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>In the abstract the section "Possession of house pets 23(25.3%), drinking streams/rain water 27(26.7), eating meals from outside the home 47(20.6%), persons who practice open bush defaecation 23(26.4%), and household with poultry farm 43(25.6%) were significantly associated with cryptosporidiosis (P&lt;0.05). Other protozoan parasites identified were Entamoeba histolytica 88(16.1%) and Giardia lamblia 69(12.5%) although not statistically significant (P&gt;0.05). There was co-infection of Cryptosporidium and Entamoeba histolytica 27(4.9%), Cryptosporidium and Giardia lamblia 21(4.3%) which were statistically significant (P&lt;0.05) » lacks comparison numbers which included would improve the paper.</p> <p>The conclusion is also too brief and does not capture the paper's findings. The paper may again support the prior investigations that have identified that Cryptosporidium is an important protozoan etiologic agent for children attending paediatric hospitals in Enugu metropolis but the findings here are the risk factors associated with this issue.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Daniel Griffin
Department, University & Country	Columbia University, USA