



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_22862
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECT OF EXPERIMENTAL TRYPANOSOMOSIS INFECTION AND PANTIZEN TREATMENT ON THE HAEMATOLOGICAL PROFILE OF ALBINO RATS.
Type of the Article	Original Research Articles

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	This manuscript examines the effect of experimental trypanosomosis infection and pantizen treatment on the haematological profile of albino rats. The authors reported that both single and mixed infections may cause anemia and leucopaenia in animal and Pantizen® 224 treatments may reverse the anemic condition and correct the immune system. While this paper contains some novel information, the manuscript suffers from numerous critical problems, including experimental design, inadequate data, and interpretation of results. Specific comments are given below: 1. The authors failed to mention whether animal exhibits any clinical signs and symptoms after pantizen administration. If animal exhibits clinical signs and symptoms of toxicity, author should discuss the possible relationship with results they observed. 2. The experimental design is very faulty. No data or results and discussion on the assay of <i>T. brucei</i> and <i>T. congolense</i> in the experimental animals. If the authors are evaluated the hematopathologic effect of single and mixed infection of <i>T. brucei</i> and <i>T. congolense</i>, and ascertain the therapeutic effect of the Pantizen® (diminazene aceturate) on haematological parameters, data on the assay of <i>T. brucei</i> and <i>T. congolense</i> in the experimental animals should be provided. 3. The sign of chronic toxicity associates with deficit in weight gain due to food intake. However, they neither monitored body weight nor food consumption following repeated exposure to	The animals did not exhibits clinical signs and symptoms of pantizen toxicity following treatment. The dosage regimen was followed to avoid overdose and its toxicity consequences. There was data, result and discussion on the assay of <i>T. brucei</i> and <i>T. congolense</i> in the experimental animals. Groups B and C were <i>T. brucei</i> only and <i>T. Congolense</i> only respectively. Data on both groups were presented in the figures and in the table. No signs of toxicity were noted. Feed intake and body weight were not affected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	pantizen. 4. Another important thing is that the decreased erythrocytes and leucocytes in pantizen treated and trypanosomosis infected animals could result to hemolysis. Author may measure the levels of bilirubin to confirm this outcome. 5. Since the experimental design in the abstract and in the body of the manuscript is conflicting, review of the data interpretation and discussion do not make any sense. 6. Wrong way of discussing result in research article. All the parameters assay for in the results should be discussed together in paragraph(s) without using each of them as a subheading. 7. The results tables are complicated. I believe you can redesign or compress the tables into just two by dividing the hematological parameters into two table i.e. four parameters per table. 8. Other comments are highlighted in the manuscript.	Biochemical maker such as bilirubin was not measured. It was a mistake. Groups in the abstract section are wrong. The journal guide lines were followed. The discussion was done using paragraph (s). There was no subheading in the discussion section. The subheading in the result section was according to journal guide line. Done Done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		