SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJTDH_22394**
Title of the Manuscript:	**PHYLLOPLANE PARASITES ON COMMON EDIBLE PLANTS OF EASTERN NIGERIA: EASY LINK TO INTESTINAL PARASITES TRANSMISSION.**
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:

(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	This is a basic work but is an interesting study of an important issue in public health, such as is the transmission of intestinal parasites through the consumption and use of plants, and on the most appropriate measures for its control. The work contains a number of issues that must be deeply reviewed: In the introduction, the authors must include epidemiological data and references to support the assertion of increased parasitic infections related to the use and consumption of plants, and locate geographically this data (Worldwide, Africa, Nigeria?) The authors do not explain why they selected these three plant species, and why they analyzed a small number of samples (only 10 of each plant). The main weakness of the study is the small number of samples. To obtain meaningful results and solid conclusions, the analysis of a higher number of samples would be needed. In my opinion, under the present conditions, the work could be considered as a Short Research Article instead of as an Original Research Paper. The number of parasitized samples mismatch in Tables 1 and 2. In table 1 there are 22 positive samples; in table 2 there are 19 positive samples. Further, there are errors in	We welcome the reviewer's comments and suggestions and due revisions have been made. The plant species were selected due to extensive use of their leaves in wrapping food stuffs. This has been indicated in the methodology section. We think the work can go as Original Research Paper, however, the decision remains the prerogative of the editor. The mismatch and wrongly presented results in tables 1 and 2 have been noted and corrected accordingly. Citations in the text have been corrected according to the

	the right column of Table 2 (PS%): % PS in *Musa sapientum* is 50% and no 60%; Total % PS would be 63,3% with those values (19 of 30), and no 190%. This 63.3% of positive samples does not match the 73.3% in Table 1. Overall, the results are not well represented in the tables, especially in Table 2. Citations in the text are not in the correct format. Under the rules of the journal, in the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets. References are listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. But in the text, citations are indicated by author name and year. It should review the wording, and the typos must be corrected. For example, in the title, uppercase and lowercase letters are mixed in phylloplane. In line 44 is written *Trichuris trichura*, instead of *Trichuris trichiura*.	rules of the journal. The wordings and typos have also been reviewed according. The contributions and suggestions of the reviewer are appreciated.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		