

**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><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. In this manuscript, the author, through the literature, informs the scientific community about paragonimiasis in general and pulmonary paragonimiasis in particular. the author draws the attention of health decision-makers in the Indonesian state to this globally neglected parasitosis. The text is very informative, as far as I'm concerned.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is acceptable, but the author should specify that it is a literature review. So I propose this: "pulmonary paragonimiasis: a systematic review"</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. No, the author adds some sections: -Methods to describe the choice of articles cited, how many articles did he read, etc... -Results: having scoured the literature, the author must tell his readers the status in each continent as the title of his article mentions " Paragonimiasis: A Global Neglected Tropical Lung Disease"</p> <p>5. No</p> <p>6. Here, the author reviews the literature, but makes certain statements that are not supported by a reference. I quote some of them: line15 "Paragonimus.....hots"; lines26-30 "The gold.....lung masses"; lines55-56 "The tropies....countries"; lines197-202 "The flukes.....or faeces"..... From the above, I would say that the text is poor in references. What's more, 35% of its references are more than 10 years old.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION comments</b></p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><b>Optional/General comments</b></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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>N'DRI Kouadio Thierry-Borel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pasteur Institute of Côte d'Ivoire, Côte d'Ivoire</b>