

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_124726
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDIES OF THE LACTATE DEHYDROGENASE CONTENT IN TISSUES OF MESOCRICETUS AURATUS INFECTED WITH ANCYLOSTOMA CEYLANICUM
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 study investigated a common tropical infection, hookworm in hamster to determine the activity of lactate dehydrogenase , a key enzyme in glucose metabolism. The activity of the enzyme can help in the development of novel therapeutic agents in treating hookworm infection.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No EFFECTS OF ANCYLOSTOMA CEYLANICUM INFECTION ON LACTATE DEHYDROGENASE ACTIVITY IN TISSUES OF MESOCRICETUS AURATUS	
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.	The abstract is insufficient and too theoretical. It dwelled too much on introducing the topic, failed to clearly state the aim, justification and methodology of the study. The author should introduce the study with just two sentences; clearly state the aim and justification for the study. Provide a brief insight on the experimental design and how ANCYLOSTOMA CEYLANICUM INFECTION was induced in the experimental animals. Author should also present the result in clear statistical terms, and conclude adequately.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Author should expunge the section tagged literature review, summarize and add it to the introduction. The introduction was also too lengthy and will make reader lose interest in the article. Also, the author did not mention anything about the experimental design, laboratory animals and their grouping, how the induction of the infection was carried out. Authors did not also provide any information on statistical analysis, which is supposed to be a subsection on its own and clarify the statistical software used.	
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.	Although the author failed to adequately provide a clear aim and justification for the study, He/She/They tried to evaluate the activities of lactate dehydrogenase activities in various tissues of hamster induced with hookworm infection. The author tried to provide insight into the effect of hook worm infection in host carbohydrate metabolism, thus providing useful insights into the pathogenesis and survival of hookworm in the host. This can be useful in developing therapeutic targets in the treatment of hookworm. A meticulous review and reorganization of the manuscript by the author will bring out the robustness in this study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Too many old references. Particular incidence was a reference of 1985 being referred to as a recent statistics.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The author is advised to study the journal's author guidelines/instruction to authors and follow the template and guidelines meticulously. The results (tables) were also poorly presented; references did not follow the journals specifications on arrangement. The font size were also not uniform and the typesetting was not justified.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abigail Okezi Isoje
Department, University & Country	Dennis Osadebay University, Nigeria