

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_78531
Title of the Manuscript:	GASTROINTESTINAL HELMINTHS PARASITES OF CATTLES SLAUGHTERED IN GWAGWALADA ABATTOIRS
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:

(<https://journalsajp.com/index.php/SAJP/editorial-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract. I recommend the authors that briefly describe the importance of this study or why they did it because it is not clear the context of these survey. For instance, what is the impact these parasites have in the Gwagwalada people? These are predominant zoonosis among them? Or how these parasite affects animal production?</p> <p>Material and methods. - This statement "A total of 160 fecal samples of freshly slaughtered cattle were randomly collected from the rectum, with 40 samples each from four (4) different abattoirs located in Gwagwalada" should be in section "Sample collections" as it describes how the authors obtain the faecal samples.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The sections "Evaluation of helminthic parasites" and "Identification of helminthic parasite" should be fused into one as they describe the same method: how they obtain and identified the helminth species. - Regarding this statement "Cheesebrough (2016) used dichotomous keys to identify the helminthes parasites. Microscopic examination of the helminthic parasites was done at X40 magnification. The parasites were identified based on their shape, size, and color". the authors only looked for adults only, but not for eggs, why is this? Also, this sentence should be revised as it appears to be copy-pasted from elsewhere: did the authors made this action or Cheesebrough? - Statistical analysis section should be strongly revised: in which case the authors used the one-way ANOVA and the F-test? Also, how the authors tested the assumptions of these statistical assays? This information should be addressed, because the authors use a parametric test meant to a normal distribution, but your variable is a percentage which by its nature is limited (between 0 and 100). Thus, it is rare that this variable has a normal distribution. <p>Furthermore, it is not clear how the author treated the data: they reported a percentage, but is this percentage the mean of the 40 animals tested? If it is so, why it not reported the standard deviation in the result section, nor in the tables or the figures? All these information should be included in a research work.</p> <p>Results. It is not clear why the authors display the results as tables and as graphics as they do not add any new information to complete the result sections they describe.</p> <p>Discussion. - The authors attribute the prevalence differences found in their study with those reported earlier to poor feeding and veterinary care. However, little is said (or described) about the origins of the cattle: do the animal have access to garbage? What are the hygiene conditions in these places? Were animals breed up by small farmers? I suggest the authors to provide more information regarding the origin of the animals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regarding the last paragraph, I suggest the authors to back up their statements with bibliography because there are reports suggesting that a poor nutrition condition, for instance, led to a higher parasite burden because the immune system is affected by this condition in a negative way: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33468010/ https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30599460/ 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The format of the entire manuscript should be revised as it does not follow the authors guidelines of this journal. Also, the spelling should be revised, especially helminth parasite names.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		

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:	<i>Maria Priscila Saracino</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Universidad De Buenos Aires, Argentina</i>