



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_13094
Title of the Manuscript:	SCHISTOSOMIASIS: THE DISEASE, ANTI-SCHISTOSOMA VACCINE CANDIDATES AND BABOONS AS IDEAL MODELS IN SCHISTOSOMIASIS STUDIES
Type of the Article	A review 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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	1. The major point here is the story of the main schistosome vaccine 'candidates' and 'baboons as the preferable/ideal models' in the schistosomiasis field. However, the authors have overlooked that concept and did not clearly show these important components of the review that can match with the selected title. For example, all the vaccine antigens they tried to touch in the manuscript are not all 'vaccine candidates'. Most of the statements are dealing with old information (references), the current prospects of each antigen were not clarified and which of these are the most promising ones? Or are these antigens all useful/useless? Any clinical trial studies using any of the antigens? What happened at the end? Did they show some progresses using like baboon models to begin with? And so on...	This review looks at the disease schistosomiasis in great details. Schistosome vaccine candidates are also discussed. It should be noted that so far there is no vaccine for this disease and all vaccine antigens identified are candidate vaccines with a few having progressed to clinical trials. This review has highlighted their characteristics and efficacies. The reviewer rightly refers to them as vaccine antigens; therefore they are still vaccine candidates. A lot of studies are being done to refine them. Other new antigens with potential as vaccine candidates are continuously being discovered. Those that have showed good results in baboon model such as Sm-p80 calpain need to be moved forward to human clinical trials. Sh28 GST has moved to phase II and Sm14 to phase I clinical trials, and this has been mentioned in the paper.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	2. For 'a big review article' like this, enough	In the revised paper the background information is enough. It has touched on



SDI Review Form 1.6

	background information is important. But, in this manuscript, key points like fishing, agricultural activities and new irrigation establishments were not given as the factors of transmission. The social or economic impact of the chronic disease = DALYs (incapacitation due to the infection known as disabled activity life years) no mention in the manuscript. Please give the complete picture of the disease, the problems it causes, and where are we to control the schistosomes? The authors have tried to present about anti-schistoma vaccines and baboons as ideal models for schistosomiasis studies. But the manuscript lacks the following important information: 1. The key point here is telling the readers about the story of the main schistosome vaccine 'candidates' and 'baboons as the preferable/ideal models' in the schistosomiasis field.	most areas the reviewer is concerned with. DALYs (disability-adjusted life years) for schistosomiasis has been stated in the manuscript. The complete picture of the disease, the problems it causes, and where we are in the control of schistosomiasis has been clearly highlighted in the manuscript.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	However, the authors have overlooked that concept and did not clearly show these important components of the review that can match with the selected title. In addition, the vaccine antigens they tried to touch in the manuscript are not all 'vaccine candidates'. 2. Most of their statements are dealing with old information (references), the current prospects of each antigen were not clarified and which of these are the most promising ones? Or are these antigens all useful/useless? Clinical trial studies using any of the antigens? What happened at the end? Did they show some progresses using like baboon models to beginwith? And so on... 3. For 'a big review article' like this, enough background information is important. But, in this manuscript, key points like fishing,agricultural activities and new irrigation establishments were not given as the factors of transmission. 4. The social or economic impact of the chronic disease = DALYs (incapacitation due to the infection known as disabled activity life years)-no mention in the manuscript. Please	Corrected (see comments above) See comments above. See comments above Has been updated This has been included in the revised paper.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	give the complete picture of the disease, the problems it causes, and where are we with regard to controlling the schistosomes? 5. I do not see the difference b/n Calpain and Sm-p80, only the latter is the large sub-unit of the calpain. Please use one title to tell the story of similar vaccine antigens. 6. By the way, Sm-p80 has very update information about its vaccine use in baboons, however, no thing mentioned in this manuscript.	See above comments. Information on this has also been included in revised paper. Corrected Update information has been included.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I do not see the difference b/n Calpain and Sm-p80, only the latter is the large sub-unit of the calpain. Please use one title to tell the story of similar vaccine antigens. By the way, Sm-p80 has very update information about its vaccine use in baboons. But no mention in this manuscript.	This has been corrected in the revised paper. This information has been included in the revised paper.
---	---	--