

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_119009
Title of the Manuscript:	MATHEMATICAL MODELING AND ANALYSIS OF TRANSMISSION DYNAMICS AND CONTROL OF HOOKWORMS IN OBI LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF NASARAWA STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the 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> <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>Yes, the manuscript has good input for medical and scientific society. It has addressed the issue in a better way</p> <p>Yes, The title of the article is correct subjectively an technically.</p> <p>Yes, The abstract is very expressive and comprehensive</p> <p>In the literature survey a discussion on the previous work done so far should have been discussed. Methodology is missing. The explanations for the graphs plotted should be done very next to the graph.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. But the detailed explanation of the work done and methodology in the work should be explained. References are sufficient. Proper format has to be followed for the references with numbering.</p> <p>The paper has details of the disease and its causes. However as discussed in the abstract the solution to the problem should be discussed in detail. The graphs plotted has no explanations and has to be explained in detail. There is no methodology for the work. Kindly concentrate on explaining the methodology.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, English suits the level of journal</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper is technically good with few major subsections missing.</p> <p>i)The paper should have a peer literature review.</p> <p>ii) The reference quoted at the end should be referenced in the paper while explaining.</p> <p>iii) Methodology should be done in detail</p> <p>iv) All the graphs should be explained in detail</p> <p>v) Previous method followed to get the details of the work done now should be mentioned.</p>	

[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:	Dhananjaya B
Department, University & Country	Nitte University, India