

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>South Asian Journal of Parasitology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_SAJP_104487</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>UNRAVELING THE KNOWLEDGE LEVEL OF DIARRHEA AMONG BIOLOGY STUDENTS IN ENUGU STATE'S COLLEGE OF EDUCATION: A COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL INVESTIGATION</b>
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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>
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>In our opinion, it is moderately important, since it refers to probative surveys of the information or knowledge of a group of students about diarrhea.</p> <p>The title is too long. We suggest shortening it this way: "Knowledge about diarrhea among university students in Enugu State". The rest is reported in the abstract.</p> <p>The summary is somewhat long; it can be shortened to be more specific. The details shown in the comments of the revised document should be amended.</p> <p>It is appropriate.</p> <p>The text presents 60 adverbs so that they could well be eliminated. It is better to rewrite it with this aspect in mind. The author also sometimes expresses himself in literary forms with metaphors that do not come from a scientific work. This should be removed. The numbering of the Tables and their statements must be rectified according to the regulations. See comments in the revised document.</p> <p>The references are quite recent, but in the bibliography there are 6 references that are not in the text. This aspect is serious and cannot be consented to.</p> <p>There are subjective assumptions in the document that should not be present.</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is quite understandable, although the adverbs are abused.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>We consider that the work could be published, if it is amended according to the suggestions indicated.</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>Luis Remedios Hernández</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Cuba</b>