



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_53929
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review on Rodent-Borne Parasitic Zoonosis: Public Health Risk to Humans
Type of the Article	Review 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>The manuscript brings an interesting introduction to a very relevant topic, the occurrence of rodent-borne parasitic pathogens. However, there are some important corrections that are necessary. I will list them below.</p> <p>Page 1 Line 23 – that have successfully Line 24 – to different environments Line 25 – species, and there Line 26 – Muridae are omnivorous Line 31 – include habitat Line 32 – disasters, had Line 34 – in human settlements Line 36 – emergence, because Line 40 – rodents</p> <p>Page 2 Line 3 – in immuno-compromised individuals. Line 5 – infections, and there</p> <p>Page 3 Why Leishmania and Chagas were not included? This makes no sense as other infections from wild rodents were commented in the text. Line 14 – (22-24), with Line 15 – being the most common Line 16 – reservoirs of Cryptosporidium parasites related to cryptosporidiosis in humans Line 19 – oocysts Line 26 – individuals. Line 46-7 – susceptible, as they could Line 50 – and is considered Line 51 – symptom</p> <p>Page 4 Line 2 – may last Line 4 – giardiasis Lines 10-17 – this paragraph is in the wrong section, it deals with Cryptosporidia Lines 29-30 – This sentence applies to all the pathogens discussed. Change place or remove. Line 33 – worldwide, and it is gaining Line 37 – Babesia species (53- Line 39 – responsible for Line 46 – reflects Line 49 – Angiostrongylosis is a severe Line 52 – disease Line 53 – cantonensis that is</p> <p>Page 5 Line 4 – as a tropical parasite Line 5 – host from more temperate...The intermediate snail host of this parasite Line 9 – Angiostrongylus</p>	



Line 13 – *Angiostrongylus*
Line 15-16 – the end of this sentence is not clear, please rewrite
Line 16 - *Angiostrongylus*
Line 18 – *Angiostrongylus cantonensis*
Line 24 – with rats.
Line 36 – *Trichinella*.....recognized. However, the
Line 37 – (73). Other
Line 38 – non-capsulated larvae muscles? What this means? Please clarify.

Page 6
Line 3 – South
Line 7 – insects
Line 18 – tapeworms that
Line 19 - *Taenia*
Line 24 – feces. Pigs or
Line 35 – is the second most worldwide common parasitic infection, apart from malaria, that is caused
Line 36 – *hematobium*
Line 43 – *Schistosoma japonicum*
Line 44 – *Schistosoma mansoni*
Line 51 – cercariae, and
Lines 35-51 – I think it would be important to make comments about the snail vector.

Page 7
Line 5 – *Macracanthorhynchus* (twice)
Line 7 – *Moniliformis hirudinaceus* is not the in previous species list.
Line 15 – into the mucosa of the host’s intestine. Low
Line 23 – adaptable and unpredictable nature – please rewrite and clarify what this means

Page 8
Figure 1 – some vectors are mollusks and not arthropods, I suggest the term “Invertebrate Vectors” instead of arthropods. Besides that, some vectors or their secretions are ingested with food or juices, so I would include an arrow from the “Invertebrate Vectors” box to the “food” box.
Line 8 – emerging and re-emerging
Line 10 – complex relations between
Line 15 – animals
Lines 14-5 – it is not clear to me the difference between items (ii) and (iii). The meaning of item (iii) is quite obscure. Please rewrite and clarify.

Page 9
Line 11 – must be examined carefully to develop
Line 19 – also to food
Line 24 – integrated
Line 25 – Further studies are required



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fernando Genta
Department, University & Country	Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, Brazil