



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_32393
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparison of Parasitological Techniques (microscopy) and Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification (LAMP) of DNA in Diagnosis and Monitoring Treatment of Trypanosoma brucei rhodesiense Infection in Vervet Monkeys (Chlorocebus aethiops)
Type of the Article	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://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 <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>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Abstract: Line 19 has two 'microscopy'. Check. Introduction: Lines 36 and 37 present that the disease 'was.... and it's currently under control.....' Then why the study? Were these reports in 1986 [23] and 2002[9] on occurrences from the same place as this study? Was this study really necessary? These should be addressed to justify the basis for this work. Material and Methods Line 84: what is TRC? Line 100: check the usage of 'for low parasitemia' in this sentence. Line 115: check the usage of 'using a microscopy' Line 135: 'include' should be included Results Presentation of the results left out Tables 1 and 2. Any justification for this? Line 231: the use of 'therefore' to begin a paragraph and sentence. The sentence between lines 232 and 234 requires modification. Also check the sentence that begins in line 234 with 'There' Discussion There appear to be so many sentences in this section that may not really be relevant, e.g. line 248 to 249; 252 to 253; 337 to 358; 363; 378 to 387. Line 261: 'is' should be was? Line 270: why was the DNA detected?	
---	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Check lines 280 and 281: the information here was not presented in the results description. Also the 'and a' at the end of line 281 checking, maybe replace with 'but'. The information in lines 304 and 307 was not presented as significant in the results section. Lines 309 and 311 should be in Material and Method section? Only major findings should be presented here and discussed. Conclusion Does not appear like a conclusion. Lines between 391 and 394 do not appear relevant. Line 402 to 404 is more of a recommendation Recommendation The text does not fit as recommendation. References Listed References do not conform with the reference style given in the Guideline for Authors for this Journal In text, references are not numbered in the order that they appear in the text. The first reference cited carries number [9], the second is [23], and so on.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ishaya Yohanna Longdet</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Biochemistry, University of Jos, Nigeria</i>