

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_75082
Title of the Manuscript:	Cystoisosporiasis and Associated risk factors in HIV-infected patients with malaria in General Hospital Minna, Niger State – Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p><u>Technical Comments</u></p> <p>A. Author have to follow the “Author guidelines of the Journal”</p> <p>C-1. Abstract section should contain: - Aims, Study design, Place and duration of the study, Methodology, Results, and conclusion. Author missed it</p> <p>C-2. The text should be in Arial font and size 10. Author should redesign accordingly in to whole research articles.</p> <p>C-3. Heading, sub-heading, and sub-sub-heading should also followed according to “Author Guidelines”</p> <p>C-4. Table and figure’s legend should also follow author guidelines</p> <p>B. References in the text are not uniform and missing some punctuation marks.</p> <p>C. English write up correction</p> <p>C-5. Improve the Readability of manuscript</p> <p>C-6. Grammar, spelling and punctuation is weak</p> <p>C-7. Conciseness and convention is needed in the MS</p> <p>C-8. Word choice and consistency should be improve</p> <p><u>Scientific Comments</u></p> <p>A. Plagiarism- The percentage of plagiarism is 46%, which is not acceptable in any form. Change all sentences.</p> <p>B. Abstract- Modify according to authors guideline</p> <p>C. Introductions-</p> <p>C-9.The sentences are not clear. Rephrase the sentences to give clear information. Clarity needed.</p> <p>C-10. Monotonous passages are also there.</p> <p>D. Experimental Methods</p> <p>C-11. Verbal consent is not enough for ethical concern.</p> <p>C-12. In statistical section, there is no data depicting strength of association between the factors taken in the study. WHY?</p> <p>E. Results and Discussion</p> <p>C-13. Flow cytometry data (figure)?</p> <p>C-14. Overall it is good but takes care about all English grammar and punctuation.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details</i></p> <p>Verbal consent was taken in this study, which is not sufficient if we consider serious ethical issue. Authors are requested to collect written informed consent.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jagdish Hansa
Department, University & Country	Radha Govind Univesity, India