

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_120883
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge and practices toward female genital schistosomiasis among community women and healthcare workers in Anambra State, Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The research is important from a scientific standpoint for the feminist community to gain information about the case of schistosomiasis, which affects the female reproductive organs, because ignorance of it and neglect of it may have serious consequences for the female, especially since the recognized and common types of schistosomiasis are the intestinal and urinary types.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The research needs a little scientific correction, as it follows the general scientific context, such as presenting the problem and the scientific background of the topic, collecting and analyzing data, arranging the results in tables, discussing and comparing the results, drawing inferences from previous studies on the topic, and using modern sources. However, it is taken into account that the research did not use a statistical program to determine the moral of the items that were studied and some errors. Other simple ones that can be treated	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hiro Mohammed Obaid
Department, University & Country	Northern Technical University, Iraq