



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013 BMRJ 3513
Title of the Manuscript:	PARASITOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF DOMESTIC WATER SOURCES IN A RURAL COMMUNITY IN NIGERIA

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Except for <i>Balantidium coli</i>, the authors did not make any effort to distinguish helminth eggs or protozoan cysts from human origin from those of pig origin. Since there appear to be many piggeries in the study area, the presence of <i>A. suum</i>, <i>Strongyloides ransomi</i> and other pig nematodes in local water sources is highly likely. Human hookworm eggs might easily be confused with eggs of <i>Globocephalus</i> or <i>Oesophagostomum</i> spp. of pigs. It is impossible to distinguish morphologically eggs of <i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i> from those of <i>Ascaris suum</i>. The same is true for eggs/larvae of <i>S.stercoralis</i> and <i>S.ransomi</i>. The authors should make the necessary corrections and include this in the discussion. • The authors do not mention anything about <i>Cryptosporidium</i> or <i>Toxoplasma</i> cysts. They should clarify whether they have looked for these cysts or not. • The authors should clarify whether the sampling was carried out randomly or not. Please add also some figures about the total number of boreholes, wells, ponds and streams in the study area. • Lines 115-117: please provide figures for the surface of the community of Heipang (square km?) and the population. • Lines 175-179 and table 2: apparently, the samples have been taken in 10 locations. Please mention the names of these locations in "Materials & Methods". • Apparently different types of ponds have been examined (lines 210-213: deep, shallow and other ponds). The authors should clarify in the Materials & Methods how many of each type of pond have been examined. The number of positives of each type should also be included in table 1. 	<p>Due to financial constraints we couldn't go further in differentiating eggs and parasites to specie level since most of the are morphologically indistinguishable. However, instead of using specific names such in <i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i>, we decided to use a more general term like <i>Ascaris</i> species. This is because our major aim is to highlight parasitic infestation of water sources and to draw the attention of the populace especially policy formulators.</p> <p>We also reported only the parasites we encountered in the study</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line 102: please use more recent figures instead of those of WHO (1996) • Line 102: please replace 'Vanden, 1984' by "Van den Bossche (1984) • Several references are not included in the reference list: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Line 158: Cheesbrough (2000) ○ Line 237: Chollom et al. (2012) ○ Line 243: Okwonkwo (2000) • Lines 309, 316, 317: incomplete references. Please complete. • There are many typing errors which should be corrected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ i.a. lines 168, 173, 222, 252 (replace 'He' by 'They') ○ Replace 'hook worm' by 'hookworm' 	<p>Corrections effected</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		