

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Parasitology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_85265
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Cryptosporidium parvum Co-infection in relation to CD4+ T-Lymphocyte count in patients living with HIV/AIDS attending Umaru Shehu Ultra-modern Hospital Maiduguri, Nigeria</b>
Type of the 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**

	<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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript can present interest for the scientific community. However, several improvements all necessary, as I highlighted below:</p> <p><u>Overall comment</u>  <b>I strongly recommend:</b> please improve the English content and the scientific style of the manuscript. Within the Introduction and Discussion chapters, I recommend to use the present perfect (i.e., samples have been found) and when present the materials and methods, as well as the results, use the past tense (i.e. samples were found). It is no so indicated the using of different time forms like in the Introduction section “some patients have severe symptoms” vs. “have not been adequately investigated”</p> <p><u>Specific comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduction: for a correct review of the zoonotic potential of <i>Cryptosporidium</i> species please consult and cite the following update reference: (doi:10.3390/ani11113307)</li> <li>- “the present study is aimed at investigating ...” – rephrase, not scientifically sound. The study aim is unclear defined and in the present form is not understandable.</li> <li>- concerning the statement “Sample size was determined using the following formula” please be more explicit indicating the meaning of each letter from the formula.</li> <li>- one hundred and twelve (112), seven (7) - pleonasm</li> <li>- “K<sub>4</sub>EDTA” for all of the used reagents throughout the manuscript please clearly indicate the manufacturer name, city and country</li> <li>- “safety precautions were observed” please be more explicit for the reader;</li> <li>- “observed microscopically” – please specify the used microscope objective</li> <li>- “patients were grouped into 0-50, 51-100, 101-200 ...” – please indicate a reference according to which you make this classification</li> <li>- the first three sentences from the results section please incorporate in the materials and method, they cannot be considered results.</li> <li>- when you express overall prevalence values like “...prevalence of 24.1%.” please indicate in brackets the 95% Confidence Interval</li> <li>- the authors must to insert a supplementary column in the Table 1 indicating the exact p values, as result of comparisons between the recorded values for each studied demographic variable</li> <li>- “<i>Cryptosporidium species</i>” species not italic and spp.</li> <li>- <i>C. species</i> – unclear</li> <li>- “Association between CD4 count and <i>C. species</i> infection was statistically significant.” – please indicate the exact p value</li> <li>- “Cryptosporidium” – in the title of table 2 please italicize</li> <li>- please de-italicize the title of the figure 5, except the name of <i>Cryptosporidium parvum</i></li> <li>- please define the figure 6</li> <li>- when the authors compare prevalence values between studies, they need to ensure to compare studies with the same design. Also, they need to mention the factors that can be markedly influenced the registered differences.</li> <li>- the authors need to complete the discussion chapter with the study limitation and future perspectives. Also, it is important to know if any of the monitored demographic variable, can be considered risk factor. Please calculate the Odd Ratio.</li> <li>- the last sentence from the conclusion section is very general, and not in direct correlation with the presented results. Please rephrase it.</li> <li>- please italicize the genus name <i>Cryptosporidium</i>, throughout the reference list</li> <li>- THE REFERENCE LIST IS NOT UNIFORM AND IT IS NOT IN AGREEMENT WITH THE JOURNAL REQUIREMENT!!!</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

<b>Optional/General</b> comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

**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?	<i><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	Kálmán Imre
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	Romania