

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_126841
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Trichomonas vaginalis and Neisseria gonorrhoeae infections among females attending healthcare facilities in Port Harcourt, Nigeria
Type of the Article	

[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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript provides valuable insights into the prevalence of <i>Trichomonas vaginalis</i> and <i>Neisseria gonorrhoeae</i> among females attending healthcare facilities in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. It addresses a significant public health issue, as both pathogens are globally prevalent yet often underdiagnosed. By identifying prevalence rates and associating them with demographics like age, residence, and marital status, this study highlights factors that may contribute to infection risks in specific population segments. The manuscript stands out for its practical implications in resource allocation and targeted intervention, making it an essential contribution to the scientific community's efforts to control and prevent these infections.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article, "<i>Prevalence of Trichomonas vaginalis and Neisseria gonorrhoeae infections among females attending healthcare facilities in Port Harcourt, Nigeria</i>," is clear</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article covers the key aspects: background, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, it could be enhanced by adding more context to certain points and refining the presentation for better clarity and impact. Here are some suggestions:</p> <p>Suggested Additions:</p> <p>Background Context: Briefly state the public health significance of <i>Trichomonas vaginalis</i> and <i>Neisseria gonorrhoeae</i> infections to emphasize the study's relevance.</p> <p>Objectives: Explicitly outline the study objectives, such as identifying prevalence rates and analyzing demographic risk factors.</p> <p>Statistical Significance: Mention whether the associations found between specimen types and infection prevalence were statistically significant, as this adds rigor to the findings.</p> <p>Implications for Public Health: Add a sentence on the practical implications of these findings for public health strategies, particularly for Port Harcourt or similar settings.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript generally follows an appropriate structure, with sections covering the background, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion, which are essential for scientific clarity.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its clear, methodical approach to analyzing the prevalence of <i>Trichomonas vaginalis</i> and <i>Neisseria gonorrhoeae</i> infections among a defined population in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. The study uses a well-structured retrospective design, examining a substantial sample size of 351 medical records, which strengthens the validity of its findings. The authors employ established laboratory methods, such as wet preparation microscopy and culture, to accurately identify infections, while also using statistical tests (Pearson's Chi-Square and Fisher's exact test) to validate associations between demographic factors and infection rates. By presenting these associations and limitations transparently, the manuscript demonstrates scientific rigor and offers reliable data to inform public health strategies in the region.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The manuscript's references are generally sufficient and relevant, providing a solid foundation for the study</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and precise terminology that aligns with scientific standards. However, there are areas where readability and flow could be improved. Some sentences are lengthy and complex, which may hinder clarity. Breaking these sentences into shorter, more direct statements would enhance readability and allow the scientific insights to stand out more effectively.</p> <p>Additionally, minor grammar and syntax adjustments would improve coherence and ensure that the language meets high academic standards. Revising for conciseness and maintaining active voice in places where it would enhance clarity could further improve the article's language quality, making it fully suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Overall, this manuscript makes a valuable contribution by highlighting the prevalence of <i>Trichomonas vaginalis</i> and <i>Neisseria gonorrhoeae</i> infections in a specific Nigerian population, which has important implications for public health strategies in similar settings. The study design is sound, and the statistical analysis strengthens the findings. However, the manuscript would benefit from slight structural refinements to improve clarity, such as adding explicit subsections in the methodology and results for better readability.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zaid Iqbal
Department, University & Country	Nanjing Tech University, China