



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 CONGOLENSIS</i> ON CANINE DYSPYREXIA 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 (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	Title needs revision: Suggested title: An assessment of immune response of canine distemper vaccinated dogs experimentally infected with <i>ancylostoma</i> and <i>trypanosome</i> organisms. Arrange abstract chronologically in this format 1.Background 2.Aim 3.Methodology 4.Results conclusion Line 13 and 14: State that the trypanosome were superimpose in the individual groups, don't make general statement 15-17 preparent period for these infectious agents are different. in groups treated with two organism the preparent periods needs expressed as two periods not just one, like is an average Line 17 antibody titre against what: state it Did you ascertain the protective antibody titre against canine distemper (serum neutralizing antibodies) to ascertain if the dogs finally ascertain this level, even though there was immunosuppression initially. Because if this is ascertain. Then we can say categorically that dogs vaccinated with canine distemper vaccine and are	Thanks for the suggested title it has been accepted. The abstract is ok as presented 1The prepatent periods were well presented to avoid repetition and too wordy text. The protective antibody level have been stated. I've updated the citation on line 44 I think the role and the type of chemotherapy administered was clearly stated in the abstract also it was mentioned that it had not effect in enhancing the poor sero conversion. However ive included that the treatment was given to all the groups as suggested. The ages, sex and the number used were clearly stated and although age could be a factor that influence immune response but in this particular research it was not the main factor under consideration and that was the reason why a range of age bracket



SDI Review Form 1.6

	infected with or infection with May not allow be able to appropriately seroconvert the vaccine administered Line 44..... quote a recent literature, literature you quoted to support the endemicity of the two infections are too old Line 45 I don't understand the role of chemotherapy, didn't reflect in your groupings or in your aim in your abstract, I feel chemotherapy is irrelevant in your study, as poor seroconversion seen in your study is due to the infection you initiated, and when you treat you will get variable result. Except you determining antibody levels in dogs initially given routine chemotherapy treatment before vaccination. Although as you have made it part of your study, make it clearer in your abstract and state clearly the therapy instituted in each group in your abstract Line 50 State the age of the dogs, and you said both sexes, its too ambiguous, how many males how many females, and were they all the same age. As age can also influence immune response. As age and sex could be factors to be considered in the final result Line 96 english need revision 124 -142 explain all the acronym PBS, PPR. HIT etc Line 195 – 195 good u make reference to rabies but what of as it concerns canine distemper, your research is on canine distemper, as I asked what is the protective level (	was randomly selected in each group. The acronyms have been stated. I have included the protective level of canine distemper. Only mebendazole was used on the dogs because of its immune boosting and anthelmintic effect besides the experiment was not designed to administer cocktail of drugs in the treatment of the dogs. I have removed line 216-217 as suggested. Ethical consideration has been included. Your suggestions on recommendation are valid and well taken.s
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	serum neutralizing antibodies) of canine distemper. 202 -203 why wasn't iron part of your treatment, since you know the deleterious effect of the ancylostoma. 216- 217 remove this, as it seems your management killed the animal 228 revise English 230 the standard vaccination protocol of distemper vaccine which is commonly a part of a cocktail vaccine ca (DHLPP vaccine) containing a mixture of canine distemper, hepatitis, leptospirosis, parvovirus and parainfluenza) is a 3 shots program usually starting in pups like 8weeks and each shots given within 2weeks to 1 month interval. Recommendation should entail chemotherapy after lab confirmation prior to vaccination, and the 3 shot vaccination program should be adhere to ensure appropriate immune response. While adult should take a yearly shot after appropriate chemotherapy when needed. I didn't see you including any ethical considerations and permissions	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	An in depth literature review need be done as regard researches on canine distemper with recent refernces Please clarify the ethical issues if any as it includes use of animals and infecting them with infectious agents	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		