

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_108313
Title of the Manuscript:	GASTROINTESTINAL TRACT OPPORTUNISTIC PARASITIC INFECTIONS AMONG HIV/AIDS PATIENTS UNDER ART IN THE DSCHANG HEALTH DISTRICT
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I think so.</p> <p>Partly yes</p> <p>Yes, unless the methods are clearly explained.</p> <p>At least 20 references, meaning at least 6 more.</p>	<p>Okay</p> <p>Okay</p>
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Must be edited.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The intension of the manuscript is Ok. But the following should be examined.</p> <p>Methods.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How was the sample size of 353 arrived at or calculated. Why was wet mount not conducted, which might have identified other intestinal opportunist parasites, including blastocystis (Zhang SX 2023). Why did the authors mix 5 g of stool samples with 7 ml of 10% formalin for concentration technique. To me, 5 g is a lot because in most people hands, 1-2 g is the most common amount used. What was the exclusion criteria. Authors though write in Figure 1 “individuals suffering of chronic diseases. What are these diseases, and how were they diagnosed? In the results, it is important to seek a third opinion to make sure that the statistical methods conducted were accurate. Authors write that “patients that followed ART therapy for more than 10 years were more infected with intestinal opportunistic parasites followed by those who had therapy for less than 5 years. Unless I am missing something, this result must be discussed. In the discussion section authors mentioned in reference to coccidiosis that modified Ziehl Neelsen staining techniques are not done in the hospitals. Yet, in the method they talk about using the method. It is confusing unless clarity is provided. Some references in the discussion section were not cited. Several errors throughout the text including grammar. Therefore, the whole text needs extensive editing. 	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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