



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_14905
Title of the Manuscript:	IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE EFFECT OF EXPERIMENTAL SINGLE <i>ANCYLOSTOMA CANINUM</i> AND MIXED INFECTIONS OF <i>TRYPANOSOMA BRUCEI</i> AND <i>TRYPANOSOMA CONGOLENSE</i> ON CANINE DYSTEMPER VACCINATION IN DOGS
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript must be reviewed by a native speaker of English. Line 17 – antibody titre against which agent? The Abstract is incomplete; a conclusion sentence should be added. Line 31 – define CDV and CPV-2 Line 32 – delete the first name out of the second reference	The prepatent period is the interval between infection and appearance of parasite in the blood or <i>ancylostoma</i> eggs in the faeces. And the agents are clearly stated on the paper. The species name has been duly abbreviated. The way the author's name was cited is correct



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 112 – define PPR Line 115 – define HA Line 212 – define HU Line 124 – define HIT The Experimental design section should be summarized. Line 145 – what do the authors intend as prepatent period? Which agent are they referring to? Species names in Latin should be abbreviated after they first show up. Line 192-194 – the sentence is not clear. Lines 218-231 – the authors should	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	more clearly draw a conclusive sentence.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please clarify the ethical issues if any An ethical approval for the experimental use of dogs is missing.	The ethical approval has been cited
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		