



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article:	Minireview paper

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
This author insists in improper use of biology concepts and expressions (see commentary C2, C6, C8, C10-C14, C21, C22, C37, C40, C43, and so on). As stated in some of my comments, this author does not show a sound biologic or epidemiologic basic knowledge or understanding.	The specific comments are addressed below
Comment 1: No. Poor term. Humans are no link and do not exchange most parasites with dogs: no Cryptosporidium, no Toxocara, no Ancylostoma, no Dipylidium, no Echinococcus, no Trypanosomes ...Look for another expression.	Sentence has been rephrased, line 9
Comment 2: I thought we had talked about this before. It seems that you still do not understand the biology of these zoonoses or the terminology. I definitively cannot accept this.	Sentence has been rephrased 12
Comment 3: Cats also share similar genera of some parasites as dogs, you know...	Yes. However, the focus of the manuscript is on dogs and so infections in cats have not been discussed



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

Comment 4: How is this going to happen? Who should be the main conductor of information and action? Communities have more pressing worries. Should it be veterinarians? Should it be a program at the Ministry of Health or at the Agricultural and Animal Husbandry Ministry? communities have very little power and knowhow and resources. Your paper is not going to be read by any community, but by others...such as...	Sentence has been rephrased, lines 16-18.
Comment 5: Which is it? Helminthes? Helminths?	Helminths
Comment 6: Sorry!!! No.	The sentence has been rephrased, lines 26-27.
Comment 7: Parasite transmission? Disease may or may not develop.	This is true. "Parasite" has also been inserted, line 28.
Comment 8: Through dog feces... Are you a dog hater? Why do you insist in blaming the dog? It is the responsibility of dog owners to avoid all these parasites by keeping the animals well fed, dewormed, sterilized (no puppies), bathed and loved. Somebody or some law should take proper care of stray animals, which are really the ones contaminating the environment.	No, I am not.
Comment 9: I gather that instead of raising awareness you seem to want to scare or alarm people.	No at all. The statement is meant to create awareness on the effects that parasites may have on the human host. For example <i>T. canis</i> infection in dogs maybe uneventful but infection in humans (children) may result in symptoms such as those highlighted by Hotez et al., 2009 (cough, wheezing, seizures, etc) which may be severe.
Comment 10: If this were true we all would be infected and ill. You should use correct terms, not to unduly frighten or alarm, but properly inform	This was to emphasise the point that, contact with dogs increases the possibility of coming into contact with infective stages of the parasite. Contact with animals has been reported as a risk factor for infection with some parasites, e.g. <i>Cryptosporidium</i> (Preisner et al. 2003). However, "High" has been deleted, line 37.
Comment 11: Except for <i>Toxocara canis</i> , infection in children are so rare, that when they happen they usually deserve a publication.	Yes they are rare. The emphasis is on the children, that, if infection was to occur, it is more likely to be in children than in adults
Comment 12: How about this: "These animals, often living in the same households with toddler-age children, pass enormous numbers of eggs in the feces daily for many months. Although the feces of a small dog or cat will be dissipated in a short time, the eggs of their parasites accumulate in the environment". Now this, besides being scientifically correct, is beautifully said. It goes on and on, but I am not going to write it all. Beaver PC, Jung R, Cupp E. Lea & Febiger, 9th. Edition, 1984.	The sentence has been rephrased, lines 37-41.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

Comment 13: Feces of dogs within houses are simply not there, owners take care of proper disposal.	Yes, dog faeces are not within houses, but the surroundings of the houses. In densely populated residential areas in our setting, dog faeces may not be removed regularly. "Within houses" has been deleted, lines 43-44.
Comment 14: Better state: stray, unkept dogs that defecate indiscriminately...	Sentence has been rephrased, lines 43-44.
Comment 15: From an epidemiologic point of view, almost no importance.	"as well as the wind" has been deleted, line 45.
Comment 16: Of dogs?	"Of dogs" has been inserted, line 53.
Comment 17: I have read Meinhardt paper several times and she says nothing of what you wrote in the sentence above. On the contrary, she is very careful in the use of words, and is constantly reminding the reader with words like: "still unclear", "may be", "conflicting evidence", "caution is warranted in the use of these surveys" ... etc. At the beginning of her paper she states: "The severity, persistence and ultimate outcome of the infection is typically dependent..."; "in immunocompetent" ... "in immunocompromised..." etc. Please, take example, be careful.	Sentence has been rephrased, adapted from the Meinhardt paper, lines 67-69.
Comment 18: Should this sentence precede the anterior one?	The sentences have been rearranged, lines 71-76.
Comment 19: None of these, with the exception of <i>C. canis</i> has anything to do with dogs.	Other species of <i>Cryptosporidium</i> have been deleted, line 76.
Comment 20: Only Ref. 19 relates to a "possible" dog-child transmission; in another the transmission was to an HIV infected person, not the rest 20-24.	The paragraph has been shortened and sentences rephrased to reflect the cited references, lines 79-81.
Comment 21: Why all this paragraph when nothing is for sure? You definitively have a bias in writing this paper, therefore the outcome cannot be considered scientific and truly informative.	The paragraph has been shortened and sentences rephrased. The cited articles reported finding <i>C. canis</i> in humans. Even if the source of infection was not stated or known, it is important that such findings are highlighted as they indicate the possibility of humans getting infected with other species of <i>Cryptosporidium</i> other than <i>C. hominis</i> and the zoonotic <i>C. parvum</i>. This of course depends on host and other factors.
Comment 22: Contamination from infected humans or their feces are definitively more important than dog's. In that case the sentence should better read: "...contact with faeces, be it human or dog..."	Sentence has been rephrased, lines 93-94.
Comment 23: Are you talking about humans? Immunocompetent dogs??	Sentence was referring to dogs. It has been deleted, lines 105-106.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

Comment 24: Giardia from birds are morphologically very different. There is no evidence for human infection with Giardia of birds. Comment 25: ...and therefore, this particular region or area or whatever you may want to call it, was considered of epidemiologic importance in the transmission human-dog-human... or something like that.	“and birds” has been deleted, line 119. Sentence has been rephrased, line 138-139.
Comment 26: Only in that specific area of temples in Thailand. Don’t spread it all over. Comment 27: Another study in domestic dogs? Animals? Which animals? In Zambia... Comment 28: Not for Giardia specifically. This combination may be used in multiparasitized dogs.	This has been specified, line 42. Sentence has been rephrased, line 149. Yes. Since the focus is on <i>Giardia</i>, other parasites are not discussed
Comment 29: The purpose is to keep animals free of parasites. Comment 30: By the ingestion of Giardia cysts.... Comment 31: In this one place in Thailand only....	Yes, that is true. Keeping animals free from parasites will in turn help to prevent human infection as there will be reduced environmental contamination. “and humans” has been deleted, line 154. Sentence has been rephrased, 156-57. The study area has been specified, line 161-163.
Comment 32: Spelling. ...for treatment of human giardiasis. In this paragraph, which I consider out of place since it deals with human giardiasis and has nothing to do with dogs, the author either shortens it using appropriate language and definitions, or eliminates it altogether.	Spelling mistake has been corrected, line 164; and the paragraph has been shortened, lines 164-167.
Comment 33: Was there any indication that the dog was the reservoir? Comment 34: Human toxocariasis? Comment 35: very rarely, slugs.... Comment 36: And their establishment in	No, nothing is mentioned on the source of infection. Yes, “a cause of toxocariasis” has been deleted, line 215. Yes very rarely. “slugs” has been deleted, line 217. “their establishment in the small intestine” has been inserted, line 222-223.
Comment 37: Not to prevent only, but to get rid of the infection and avoid eggs of <i>T. canis</i> be spread in the environment. Comment 38: Is? In? Comment 39: Localized? I looked this up and this is the right spelling in English anywhere.	Sentence has been rephrased, “and avoid spread of <i>T. canis</i> eggs in the environment” has been added, 223-224. In. This has been corrected, line 230. Localised has been changed to localized, line 242.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

Comment 40: What Despommiers writes:...visual unilateral impairment, that is sometimes accompanied by strabismus. The most serious consequence of the infection is the invasion of the retina, leading to granuloma formation. ... distopia, heteropia, detachment of the macula, endophthalmitis, papillitis... It continues and mentions the macula and is careful to state that visual acuity impairment depends on the specific area involved, etc. But you go straight to blindness....If I am a doctor or a veterinarian I would be more interested in the nature of the localized symptoms	The other clinical consequences have been included, lines 243-245.
Comment 41: Katete with capital letter? Comment 42: Imagine: so high prevalence and not one local publication of human larva migrans cutanea...	Capital “K” has been inserted, line 283. No. Not aware of any
Comment 43: Especially common? From time to time? “The symptoms evoked in children, who are seldom infected with more than a single worm, are mild and consist of slight intestinal disturbances, including indigestion and loss of appetite. Proglotids migrating from the anus of a child frequently cause anxiety in the parents”. Beaver PC, Jung R, Cupp E. Clinical Parasitology, Lea & Febiger, 1984. Reid CJD et al said:... rarely in children, when the infection may be unrecognized or misdiagnosed”... Molina CP et al said:... few reported cases of human infection... I find the term “especially common” not quite correct and trustful. Because it is rare or uncommon that a case is published.	Sentence has been rephrased and “especially common” has been deleted, lines 292-294.
Comment 44: A wrong expression. Please correct. Comment 45: What do you mean? Are dogs not domestic?	Sentence has been rephrased, lines 343-344. Dogs are domestic animals. Sentence has been rephrased, lines 358-359.