



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The first part of the manuscript should be reduced to about 75% as the information there is mostly well known in standard text. There are many places in which inline references are quoted as 'Anon.' It is unclear what that represents. If no specific references then delete 'Anon' in these places. The text from line14 in the abstract starting at 'cerebra' and ending on line 17 at 'paraplegia' should be moved to line 21 just before the statement starting with 'At present...' Line 39, It is 'approximated' should read 'estimated' and between 200 AND 300 not -300. Line 63, DR Congo and Nigeria are not East Africa. Next sentence 'endemic' should read 'endemicity for S. mansoni.... Line 97 DNA 'amplification' not 'ampulification' Line 137, venous not 'veinous' Lines 200-204 are a repeat of lines 140-146 and should be deleted. Line 212, 'disease' should be replaced with 'illness' Line 221, in standard text the acute phase is quoted to start anytime from 2 weeks for initial symptoms. Line 224, 'eosinophilia' is not a symptom. Could be replaced with cough and asthma-like symptoms. Line 247, 'haematemesiis' is one word. Same as urogenital in subsequent lines 258, 259, 263, and 264. Line 253, ...reactions during <u>the phase of</u>	1. This has been. Reduced to about 75%. 2. Anon. is used for reports from organizations and institutions such as the WHO, CDC, ECDC etc where the authors are not known. But the full details are given in the reference section (see refs. 8-14). 3. Text from line 14, corrected as advised. 4. Corrected 5. Corrected 6. Corrected 7. Corrected 8. Corrected 9. Corrected 10. Acute phase start from week 6 when the female worms start to lay eggs 11. Corrected. Removed the word eosinophilia 12. Corrected as advised



SDI Review Form 1.6

	migration and early egg deposition' Figs 2 and 3 should be combined using 3A and 2B, which are better pictures and subsequent figures re-numbered from 3. Lines 388-390 are the same as 381-384 and so should be deleted. Line 402, move 'and a challending' to just after 'important'. Line 423, insert 'the' after 'In' at the beginning of the sentence. And also before 'need' on line 429. P.16, DNA vaccination: delete 657-661 up to 1993. p. 17, delete 676-681 up to 2000). Line 713, please be more specific about births. 'can give birth twice every 18 mo' does that mean they can give birth every 9 months? If so, state so please. P. 18, line 730 ?, replace 'also' with 'however'	13. The pictures should remain and should not be combined because they from two different baboons. 2A is showing a large granuloma in the liver and 3A showing a small granuloma. But the situation in colon was different pathology was less in 2B than 3B. 14. Line 402, 423 and 429 corrected as advised. 15. Lines 657-661 and 676-681 were deleted. 16. Line 713 corrected 17. Line 720 corrected
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are minor editing errors, some as stated but a few others to be checked by the editor. That is probably what the author(s) are trying to avoid by quoting anonymous in many reference areas. I don't think such common knowledge can be a plagiarism issue.	Ok. They were checked and corrected See explanation above
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I am not sure if this was an invited review or one submitted by the author(s) by themselves. The first part of the paper details what is generally found in standard text on this subject and can be reduced to about 75% easily. The strength of this review is more in respect of developments in the immunological aspects of this disease as well as prospects in vaccination. They should therefore constitute the thrust of the manuscript.	The paper covers the important aspects of the disease; schistosomiasis