



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_12639
Title of the Manuscript:	Environmental parameters and <i>Biomphalaria</i> snail distribution along River Kochi, West Nile region, Uganda
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:

(<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the abstract part: the authors should describe or mention type of study design of the study - In the discussion part, line 176: the word see also is not necessary. - Reference 4: <i>Schistosoma mansoni</i> should be italic and there should be a space between <i>Schistosoma</i> and <i>mansoni</i>. - Reference 5. There should be consistency in placing the publication year of the listed references such as Ongom V.L. & Bradley D.J. 1972 is different from other references. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The study design has been mentioned in the abstract. - Word 'see also has been removed in line 176 - Words <i>Schistosoma mansoni</i> have been changed to italics all through and separated - Anomaly with the reference consistency has been rectified. The year 1972 after the author names has been removed.
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In material and methods: the authors should identify the method or formula that used to determine the abundance of the <i>Biomphalaria</i> species - In the whole parts of the manuscript: there are space errors such as line 16, schistosomamansoni and line 19, <i>Biomphalariaspecies</i>, <i>Biomphalarianamely</i> and others. So, the authors should write like <i>Schistosoma mansoni</i>, <i>Biomphalaria</i> species, <i>Biomphalaria</i> namely and others. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The authors did not calculate abundance but rather simply got the average numbers of snail species collected in a particular location for the sampling months. This will be incorporated in our subsequent studies in the area - All the spacing errors in the whole document have been corrected.
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the discussion part: it is good when the authors check the abundance and distribution of <i>Biomphalaria</i> species with related to different environmental parameters and here authors can compare and contract their result with other researches that conducted earlier related this issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A bit of the comparison has been done under discussion section. We appreciate all the comments and we are sure they have improved the quality of our paper greatly.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- In the conclusion part: it is good when the author put the general result and then the recommendation.- It is also good when the authors check whether the <i>Biomphalaria</i> species are infected by cercariae or not for better protection.	
--	---	--