

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_84898
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF BOVINE CYSTICERCOSIS IN JIGJIGA CITY MUNICIPAL ABATTOIR AND TREATMENT COSTS OF HUMAN TAENIASIS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Abstract: please clarify that the 23,063 doses of taenicial drugs concern a 4-year period (2017-2020). - Keywords: please add 'Ethiopia', replace 'bovis' and 'Cysticercus' by 'Cysticercus bovis' - Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o replace '≤ 10°C' by '≤ -10°C'. Freezing should be at minus 10°C for 10 days! o The prevalence of bovine cysticercosis in Eastern Europe is not 4,9%, but varies from 0 to 1,7%. In Western Europe the prevalence is not 7,82%, but varies from 0,0002 to 7,82%. The other figures for America, Middle East, etc should also be corrected. o Please provide references for the figures cited in the last 5 lines of the introduction. - Sample size determination: should be based on the expected prevalence of cysticercosis (NOT hydatidosis) in previous studies. Please correct. - 3.5.1. Active abattoir survey: please clarify which organs were examined and how many incisions were made in each organ. - 3.5.2. Inventory pharmaceutical shops: please give the total number of pharmaceutical shops in the study area and clarify how many were randomly selected. It is not clear whether the total number of drugs sold and the total cost concerns the randomly selected ones or not. - 4.2. Proportion of Animal and Organ Affected: please give details on the number of cysts (range) in each of the organs and also whether the cysts were viable, caseous or calcified. - Title of Table 3: replace 'different pharmaceutical shops' by the exact number of shops examined. - Discussion: the authors should discuss their results more critically. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o They should start the discussion by the statement that meat inspection is an insensitive technique and that the reported prevalence is an underestimation (this comment is now given at the end of the ms in the conclusions). They should also give an estimate of the degree of underestimation. I refer to the following relevant publications (Kyvsgaard et al, 1990. Res Vet Sci, 49: 29-33; Jansen et al, 2017. Vet Parasitol 244: 1-6; Jansen et al, 2018. Vet Parasitol 254: 142-146). o They should also give some comments on the reliability of the collected figures concerning the number of taenicial drugs. Did the shopkeepers provide the figures or did they come from another source? Some of the drugs, particularly albendazole, are also used in veterinary medicine. Did the authors take this into account? 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objectives: drop the general objective (2.1) and include the specific objectives in the introduction. - Abstract: please replace 'ETB' by 'Ethiopian Birr' - References: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The numbering is incorrect (it jumps from 4 to 7, from 17 to 27, etc) o Most references are incomplete: the name of the journal and the page numbers are lacking. - Typing errors: <i>Cysticercus bovis</i> and <i>Taenia saginata</i> should always be in italics, the genus name with capital. - Language: should be polished 	

Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Stanny Geerts
Department, University & Country	Institute of Tropical Medicine, Belgium