

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_109913
Title of the Manuscript:	HELMINTH INFECTION AND ANAEMIA
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>the work is certainly interesting. Although it is quite general, it provides an overview of the most important parasites that cause anemia in the host. The discussion itself on that topic could be elaborated more studiously and supported by more literary data, it is essentially correct. The work is addressed to readers who have had little experience with this issue and fulfills its goal of an informative presentation.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>it is necessary to improve the selection of references, especially in the field of parasitological diagnostics</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I am not professionally qualified for an adequate language recession, but from my point of view it is clear and understandable for scholarly communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>- The introduction is quite extensive and in my opinion the example in paragraph two that mentions an example from the Cold War is completely unnecessary. The same applies to the third paragraph on the taxonomy of helminths, which is generally known. Essentially, the introduction should be more oncsive and the authors would have to decide whether to list only schistosomes or other blood-feeding helminths.</p> <p>- In the chapter Epidemiology of Helminth Infections and anemia they look at several types of parasites that feed on blood and cause anemia and it is done correctly The images used by the author(s) are not originals, and for these reasons the source (site, link, etc.) must be mentioned in order to avoid problems with the copyright of the images.</p> <p>- The part about laboratory diagnostics is common knowledge, is it not out of place to mention it, the only problem is the reference used by the authors because there are much better references about laboratory diagnostics of parasites (e.g.</p> <p>1. Lynne Shore Garcia: Practical Guide to Diagnostic Parasitology. 2021 John Wiley & Sons Ltd.;</p> <p>2. Gilbert A. Castro, Leroy J. Olson: Section 4. Parasitology in: Samuel Baron (ed)Medical Microbiology, 4th edition, 1996, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston;</p> <p>3. Euzeby, J. 1981: <i>Diagnostic Experimental des Helminthoses Animales</i>, Tom 1, ITVS: Paris</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:	Ivan Pavlovic
Department, University & Country	Scientific Institute of Veterinary Medicine of Serbia, Serbia