



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_23820
Title of the Manuscript:	Parasitic Infestation in Cockroaches (<i>Periplaneta americana</i>) Obtained in Selected Areas of Metro Manila
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	The authors present a study on parasitic infestation of <i>Periplaneta americana</i> in three sites in Manila, which is claimed to be the first one of the kind published from that country. One may say that this study is a repetition from other published similar ones on the subject. My opinion as a reviewer: Improve Abstract in presentation and content: background, objectives, methodology, results, conclusions. Introduction – 1) is there any information on the cockroach as a pest in Manila? 2) What percentage of houses in Manila are infested with roaches? Would this be interesting to mention, whether such a study has been conducted or not? 3) Is this problem perceived as severe? mild? universal in this particular city or sites? Methodology – this requires better explanation. 1) A time lapse is missing. When and for how long were the insects collected? Overnight? One month? Last year? Five years ago? During the night? During daytime? Were all jars placed at the same time or on different days-nights? 2) How did the authors decide on the numbers? was it based on perceived roach scarcity or abundance? Explain. 3) Was there a written identification for the jars? How	The study has not been done in Manila, Philippines nor in any other site in the Philippines. There are studies done in other countries but not in the Philippines. Revised. There is no published material but from interviews with a lot of people considered this insect as a pest and in published materials from other countries. We did not look into roaches inside the houses only those in the streets. We have no information of such. Roaches are considered a problem but the severity is not known as no information supports it. The insects were collected one time and placed at the same time as we have to divide ourselves to collect the insects at the same time. We didn't depend it based on a number. All viable roaches were processed in the study. No. there were 35 jars per site but there were only 56 roaches in Manila, 13 in Pasay collected. There



SDI Review Form 1.6

	many jars per site? Were there only 56 jars in Manila and 13 in Pasay or were there 100 jars in each site and only in 56 and 13 were roaches trapped? 4) On what specific characteristics were the roaches identified to species? Since a taxonomic key was utilized, the authors may state in the Results – Lines 75,76 - that such and such specific characteristics were <u>confirmed</u> in the specimens caught (This would make the study a bit different from other similar ones that missed this part). 5) it is not clear whether roaches were caught individually or many insects per jar and then separated to be examined. 6) they state that only intact adults were examined. Were other stages caught? How many if any? Please clarify. 7) although it is mentioned in the Discussion, the number of sites is not mentioned in the methodology. 8) any reason as why only three sites were studied? Explain or give a reason. 9) it would enrich the study if the authors would describe each site as per characteristics: how populated, how is the sanitation in general per site, is there garbage collection regularly, do all houses have letrines, how far from each other, etc. Results – 1) Line 76= 100 roaches were collected; line 77= why say <u>about</u> and not exactly 56? Why are the authors not sure on the number collected per site? Line 78= 36% of roaches had parasites, but in Line 82= all roaches examined had more than one parasite (?) To me it is very confusing from lines 78 to 83. Maybe they should compare roaches and parasites from Manila,	were jars having more than 1 roaches and there were jars that do not have roaches trapped. Indicated in manuscript. There were jars with individual and multiple insects. Only intact adults were considered. We didn't consider the larval stages. The emphasis was more on the roaches than on the sites to avoid any stigma that people may bring about on the sites studied. It was limited based on the budget of the study and the sites were randomly selected from a fishbowl technique. The about was referring of the total 100 roaches, about 56 were from Manila. It doesn't mean uncertainty. Clarified.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	versus from Pasay versus from Quezon?? See below Table 2 comments. 2) Table 1: this table should include how many roaches per site and totals of parasites per site; also add <u>eggs</u> to the helminth names in the Table, i.e. <i>Ascaris</i> eggs, <i>Trichuris</i> eggs, hookworm eggs. Also <i>Ascaris</i> spp. 3) What stage of tick? Adult? Nymph? 4) Table 2: Number of individuals does it mean Number of parasites? Not clear. Also authors should add to the Table number of jars per site, number of roaches trapped per site and parasites. 5) Lines 88, 89: abundance of parasites from Quezon was due to the number of unidentified larvae found but not on the diversity of parasite species. This sentence is not properly worded. Discussion – Any study limitations? 1) Line 107: here the authors could discuss the environment differences found among the 3 places of Metro Manila (as suggested for the methodology) regarding sanitation, or the presence of more garbage in the street, etc., and how this relates to numbers of roaches trapped and parasite in roaches as they imply below in lines 113-117. How does Pasay differ from Quezon or Manila or viceversa? 2) Lines 111-113: show percentages in those other places for comparison: 36% in Manila versus ..% in... and %... in....) 4) Lines 113-116: as questioned before, what are the differences that the authors observed or confirmed among the sites? Discuss as I proposed above. 3) Line 126 the authors state: proper personal hygiene and proper environmental sanitation should be	Noted. Adult Yes no. of parasite individuals. The title indicates parasite abundance and not individual roaches. This statement is not written in the paper. Already indicated. The sites have not much difference as we focus on the canals along the streets. The table shows this result. Already indicated. We didn't look into those inside houses. Proper sanitation means better sanitation like cleaning of the canals and not throwing of human excreta or allowing stray dogs to roam and defecate anywhere.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	observed. What does <u>proper</u> mean as far as environment pollution and how does this relate with cockroach infestation <u>inside the houses</u>? Would like for the authors discuss this aspect in their MS. Conclusions – 1) safeguard themselves or food sources or improve environmental sanitation in order to decrease number of roaches or both? 2) Line 125: important role in transmission? Really epidemiologically significant? 3) Line 126: what is proper? 4) Line 128: in our communities? Or inside our houses? Or both?	Knowing that cockroaches bring with them parasites even in their external surface, we need to safeguard ourselves so we don't get exposed to these harmful parasites. Our food sources need to be protected so that the parasites don't end up in our food sources esp. if the roaches enter our households. Improve environmental sanitation esp. in the proper throwing of wastes and cleaning of the streets and canals will prevent the occurrence of the roaches in the area. Roaches are important mechanical transmitters of disease-causing agents. Proper is better or improved. The study focused on the external setting hence its on the community setting. It didn't focus on those found inside houses. It would not be fair to generalize inside houses since we didn't collect any inside houses only those on streets and along canals.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		