



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_40111
Title of the Manuscript:	Seroprevalence of Toxoplasma gondii Antibodies and Associated Risk Factors among School Children in Parts of Kaduna State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	<p>Abstract: Line 6 in the result section is incomplete Re-organize the introduction; thoughts should be presented in a logical order. Presently, it is disorganized.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: Line 86-87 is a repetition of line 81-82. Expunge details of study population from study design. State sampling technique too State your method(s) of Data analysis. You may want to merge data collection with analysis. State the name of the ELISA Kit used, as well as the name and Country of its Manufacturer</p> <p>Result: Tables are untidy. Should be better represented. Abbreviations inappropriate. See Author guidelines.</p> <p>Figs 1 and 2: Data on the X-axis are presented in different units (one in actual numbers and the others in percentages). They should be made uniform.</p> <p>Discussion: References cannot be used in place of Author(s)' names. State Lead Author's name et al. (year of publication) and reference appropriately. Your perceived reasons for discrepancies between your findings and those of other studies are too vague. Be more specific Line 300 negates your repeated claim through your Discussion, that consumption of raw or improperly cooked meat by your study participants accounted for seropositivity observed! Harmonize your thoughts. Line 192-198: These inferences are farfetched. Their being less likely to be associated risk factors does not make them protective! Take your <i>p</i> values into consideration too. Line 61: "The prevalence of <i>T. gondii</i>, risk factors and of previous infections varies from country-to-country..." this sentence is not clear, rephrase. References should be corrected and made uniform. See Author guidelines.</p> <p>Ethical issues: Statement of consent is inappropriate. Informed consent cannot be obtained from minors. It should have been obtained from their parents/ Guardians before commencement of study.</p>	Noted
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Expunge repetitions: Lines 134, repeated results on lines 242-245, Grammatical errors were observed on lines 27, 34, 78 as well as in the methodology and results in the abstract. They should be corrected Line 61-63: Split sentence as the 2 phrases have no basis for comparison Line 142: Local Government areas. Remove $p \leq 0.05$ and $p \geq 0.05$, just state actual <i>p</i> values. Line 47: inversely proportional to the gestational age at which maternal infection occurred,..... Line 50-52; Sentence too long, split/ rephrase. Line 58: "can be easily detected during ophthalmologic" Line 67; Change Toxoplasmosis infection to Toxoplasmosis. Line 67: Change "may be presented as" to may present as Line 67/68: First few months of life does not qualify as neonatal period so rephrase statement</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>In the Introduction, it will be better to specifically quote prevalence rates of Toxoplasmosis among children from previous studies, rather than rates detected generally as was done here. Figure 3 shows prevalence rates as well so you may want to present it before the tables</p>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>