



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_25331
Title of the Manuscript:	Parasitic zoonoses from dogs: how common are they in Zambia
Type of the Article	Minireview paper

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 MS is a minireview of some parasites of dogs that the authors point out may have zoonotic importance in Zambia. What is the purpose of the minireview? Make a list of dog parasites of interest? Inform? Raise awareness? Satisfy curiosity? Provide actual facts? It states: "focuses on common parasitic zoonoses..." with what purpose? Please explain. 2) line 22: loyalty instead of royalty? Lines 42-44: authors state that few studies in Zambia; however, I counted fourteen (minus one about rabies) publications of work conducted in dog surveys in Zambia. Authors should be more precise in their evaluations and also offer concrete information: what was found, in what percentage, etc. Readers want precise information. Line 172: misspelling toxoscariasis... Line 175-177: pica is the equivalent term to geophagy. In regards to toxocariasis, I would like to direct the authors to a very important reference that will give them the right perspective: Huw S, Holland C, Taylor M et al. Trends Parasitol 2009; 25:182-188. In summary, the authors present three protozoa and four helminths, of which only <i>Cryptosporidium</i>, <i>Toxocara canis</i>, and <i>Echinococcus</i> represent zoonosis of importance with many articles on human infections. Larva migrans cutanea is reported mainly from travellers	The reviewer's comments are not number and so are addressed as presented. The purpose of minireview is to provide facts on the available documentation on common zoonotic parasitic infections in dogs in order to raise awareness and provide information relevant to public health personnel and the communities. Lines 13, 47-48 have been rewritten to reflect this Royalty has been changed to Loyalty, line 22 Out of the 14 references noted, only six are publications on work in dogs (three on protozoa and three on helminths). However, the sentence has been rephrased to indicate limited data and specific proportions of dogs infected have been indicated in the different sections. Lines 158-160;195; 226-229; 245. Misspelt toxocariasis has been corrected, line 200. Pica has been deleted, only geophagy is used. Line 204



SDI Review Form 1.6

	to endemic areas. <i>Dipylidium</i> cases in humans are very rare. Both trypanosomes and <i>Dipylidium</i> require intermediate hosts, therefore transmission is not direct. So far, no human cases of <i>Giardia</i> from dogs have been reported. With the exception of trypanosomes and <i>Dipylidium</i>, parasite eggs are found in dog faeces and then some require a period in the soil – 3 to 4 weeks- before becoming infective. I found this minireview lacking in its presentation, authors seem to not quite interpret reports on mentioned zoonoses and in some places it is quite misleading. If the focus is on dogs, why mention <i>Cryptosporidium</i> species of all other animals? <i>C. canis</i> would have been enough, describing the special situation for human infection, and providing concrete examples, etc. Line 72 and on: the reports mentioned are not from <i>C. canis</i>, are they? <i>Lycaon pictus</i> (in the case of <i>Giardia</i>) is not a domestic animal.... Lines 109-110: the authors write as if those <i>Giardia</i> infections were acquired from dogs, but the referred author was describing giardiasis from humans [ref. 43]. Lines 124-126: “dogs that harbour the human infective <i>T. brucei rhodesiense</i>... may serve as an unknown source of infection for humans” Is there not the need for an intermediate host, the tse-tse fly? Line 153: slugs as paratenic hosts of <i>T. canis</i>? Please give the reference. Line 200: <i>Uncinaria stenocephala</i> is a parasite from dogs in Europe only. Lines 217-218: <i>E. vogeli</i> and <i>E. oligarthus</i> are exclusive of South America so far. Lines 221-222: <i>E. granulosus</i> is not transmitted by contaminated food. What kind of offal? Sentence obscure and not correct. Line 228: echinococcosis name misspelled. Line 235: clinical consequences of echinococcosis not correctly described. No mention of hydatid cyst.	Thank you for the suggested reference (Huw et al. 2009). It was very useful and some aspects have been incorporated in the manuscript I agree that cutaneous larval migrans has mostly been reported in travellers to endemic areas. The parasite is however endemic in sub-Saharan area and it is important to create aware on the existence of the parasite and the possibility of zoonotic transmission. Yes, both trypanosomes and <i>Dipylidium</i> require an intermediate host. This is indicated in lines 137 and 241-242 respectively. The possibility of human infection with <i>Giardia</i> from dogs was highlighted by Xiao et al., 2007 (Ref number 16). It is important that awareness is created. Yes, the focus is on dogs. <i>Cryptosporidium</i> spp from other animals are however, also highlighted to give an overview of zoonotic species after which emphasis is placed on dogs. The cited references (25-29) reported finding <i>C. canis</i> in humans <i>Lycaon pictus</i> is not a domestic animal. The report of <i>Giardia</i> in this animal was included in this review to confirm the presence of canine assemblages in Zambia in other animals even though this has not been reported in domestic dogs.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Nothing is said on prevention, not a word on treatment and no word on control. Emphasis ought to be placed on proper disposal of dog faeces, education of the public, more awareness on how to prevent toxocariasis in children for instance. As example, lines 174-175 mentions preventive measures for <i>Toxocara</i> and other helminths but does not spell which should those preventive measures be. The MS pretends to inform, but lacks on precision, is not quite accurate in its descriptions. In my opinion, it should be seriously revised focusing on the purpose or aim of the minireview with inclusion of a sentence or two on prevention, treatment and control. Nothing is said on the responsibility of veterinarians educating and preventing, issuing guidelines on the correct treatment administration and assisting in legislating dog deambulation and control of stray animals. It causes me certain distress the emphasis placed on dogs when in fact it is humans who are responsible to treat their pets and properly dispose dog faeces. Governments are responsible for legislating and enforcing the control of stray animals. Since the authors did not state the purpose or aim of the minireview, it is difficult to review it properly. The lack of description of preventive measures, the need for a sentence or two on treatment and also on control, I don't consider this MS ready for print. I personally believe the contents of this MS are in many places misleading and incorrect	Lines 109-110 (now lines 121-123) has been rephrased for clarity Lines 124-126 (now 145-147) Yes, there is need for a vector. This is indicated in line 137. A sentence has been added to emphasis this. Line146. Slugs are reported as paratenic hosts for <i>T. canis</i> (Fellrath J-M, Magnaval J-F. Toxocariasis after slug ingestion characterized by severe neurologic, ocular, and pulmonary involvement. Open Forum Infectious Diseases 2014, 1(2):ofu06 DOI: 10.1093/ofid/ofu063. A citation has been added, line 182. Line 200: <i>Uncinaria stenocephala</i> has been deleted; <i>E. vogeli</i> and <i>E. oligarthus</i> are exclusive of South America: this has been indicated in brackets (lines 257-258), Lines 221-222 (now lines 262-264) have been rephrased to indicate transmission of <i>E. granulosus</i> and the type of offal has been indicated. Misspelt echinococcosis has been corrected. Line 270 Clinical consequences of echinococcosis have been rewritten. Lines 282-288. A sentence or two on treatment and prevention/control have been inserted for each parasite where it was missing. Lines 81-91; 126-133; 166-169; 205-207; 233-234; 241-243; 278-282.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Concerning the role of veterinarians in the control of zoonotic infections, a paragraph has been inserted in the conclusion
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		