

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_112563
Title of the Manuscript:	Paragonimiasis: A Global Neglected Tropical Lung Disease
Type of the Article	Review Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is a review and is well written. It is scientifically good and i strongly feel that the study is important especially within their scientific community. 2. The title is appropriate highlighting the Paragonimiasis as NTD. 3. The abstract of the article was comprehensively written and is well within the guidelines. However, I suggest to include Neglected Tropical Disease (NTD) in the Keywords would be more appropriate. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript in the study are appropriate . 5. The manuscript is found to be scientifically correct with all the necessary information about Paragonimiasis with subsections that a review article requires. 6. The references used in the manuscript are found to be sufficient and in fact surplus (A total of 113 references were used). It is a mixture of both recent and outdated references. There are a few articles are found to be dating back to 1968 (Ref-26), 1998 (Ref-90), 2000 (ref-67), 2001 (ref-65) etc which are not recent and needs to be replaced. Most articles which are below 2015 needs much attention. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English language used is good and the quality of it us suitable for scholarly communications with some typographical and grammatical mistakes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I Suggest to review the study for grammatical and typographical errors using Grammarly or similar software. • Check for spelling mistake under the side heading CONSENT where 'Not Applicable' is spelled wrong. Do correct the same. • Suggest the authors to mention details related to Conflicts of interest (if any), whether the study is funded by any institute/organization or not or it is self-funded and acknowledgements (if any). 	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	K. S. Arun Kumar
Department, University & Country	Andhra University, India