

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJTDH_107924</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Ecological Risk Factors of Strongyloides stercoralis infection Sourrounding Desforestration areas East Kalimantan, Indonesia</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<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></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes. This work is relevant to the scientific community.</b> However, the manuscript's importance will depend on the quality of the research, the depth of analysis, and the novelty of the findings.</p> <p>The title of your manuscript is informative and provides a general idea of the topic you will be discussing. However, it could be improved for clarity and conciseness. Here's a revised version of the title: <b>"Evaluating Ecological Risk Factors for Strongyloides stercoralis Infection in Deforested Areas of East Kalimantan, Indonesia."</b></p> <p>The abstract provides a general idea of the study's purpose, methodology, and findings, but it lacks specific details and clarity in some areas. Expanding and refining the abstract would make it more comprehensive and informative for potential readers.</p> <p>The materials and method need to be arranged properly. You are not supposed to start with ethical considerations. There should be proper arrangement.</p> <p>Once the corrections are effected, it will be scientifically correct.</p> <p><b>Is this referencing style your journal's standard? I don't think it is properly arranged.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript need to be properly revised with scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Chioma Ogochukwu Anorue</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Alex Ekwueme Federal University, Nigeria</b>