

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Parasitology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_125205
Title of the Manuscript:	SANITARY CONDITION AROUND VICINITY OF CRUTECH FEMALE HOSTEL: USING ASCARIS LUMBRICOIDES AS AN INDICATOR
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### 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><b>REVIEW REPORT ON SANITARY CONDITION AROUND VICINITY OF CRUTECH FEMALE HOSTEL: USING ASCARIS LUMBRICOIDES AS AN INDICATOR</b></p> <p>This study offers valuable insights into the sanitation status of female hostels at the Cross River University of Technology, utilizing <i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i> as an indicator. The methodology is well-structured, providing clear descriptions of the study area, sample collection, and analysis techniques. However, there are several areas needing improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Redundancy in Methodology:</b> The methodology section contains repetitive phrases, particularly regarding the university's name, which should be streamlined for clarity.</li> <li><b>Statistical Analysis:</b> The statistical analysis lacks sufficient detail and clarity. A more comprehensive explanation of the methods and their implications would strengthen the findings.</li> <li><b>Sample Justification:</b> The justification for sample size and distribution across different hostels needs further clarification to enhance the study's robustness.</li> <li><b>Detection Methods:</b> More details on the detection methods for <i>Ascaris</i> eggs and larvae would improve the depth of the analysis.</li> <li><b>Discussion and Public Health Context:</b> The discussion does not adequately relate the findings to broader public health implications or existing literature. This connection is essential for understanding the significance of the results.</li> <li><b>Typographical and Grammatical Errors:</b> Numerous typographical and grammatical mistakes hinder the readability and professionalism of the manuscript.</li> <li><b>Vague Recommendations:</b> Recommendations for improving sanitation facilities are too general. More specific, actionable recommendations would enhance the conclusion.</li> </ol> <p>In summary, while the study is important and the approach is solid, it requires minor revisions for clarity, a more robust statistical analysis, and improved context regarding public health implications.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>		

**Review Form 3**

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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Sampa Baidya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Central Agricultural University, College of Fisheries, India</b>