

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_130483
Title of the Manuscript:	THE PREVALENCE OF COCCIDIOSIS IN POULTRY FARMS IN UYO METROPOLIS, AKWA IBOM STATE, NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study attempted to investigate the prevalence of coccidiosis and Eimeria species in one of the regions in Nigeria. Coccidiosis is among the most important parasitic diseases of poultry in Africa causing high morbidities and deaths, resulting in huge economic losses to poultry farmers. Understanding the seasonal variation in prevalence and circulating Eimeria species is important in informing intervention strategies in the region.	Yes thanks
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The term ‘poultry’ in the title should be replaced by ‘chicken’ which the study looked at.	Noted and added

Review Form 3

Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract can do with improvement of grammar and writing technique	Ok
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>The manuscript lacks scientific rigor and accuracy to warrant publication. The author(s) should address the following;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provide adequate information in the methodology that can allow replication of the study2. Improve the grammar and flow of information in the entire manuscript3. What criteria was used to select the study area?4. How many poultry farms were sampled, clearly state this in methodology5. How were the farms selected? What was the sampling frame? Since this is a prevalence study, random selection is expected to ensure representativeness of the study area6. What informed the sample size, provide a formula used for sample size calculation7. How many samples were taken per farm? Clearly state this in the methodology section8. How were the chickens housed in each farm, single housing or group housing?9. If group housing, did you pool the faecal samples, or how did you match the samples with the chickens, if pooled how was this done?10. What measures did you take during collection of samples to prevent cross-contamination?11. How did you keep and preserve the samples during transportation to the laboratory?12. How long were the samples stored in the laboratory before analysis13. What was the need for the temperature and humidity data collected?14. The term 'bird' is confusing, use 'chicken' uniformly throughout the text15. Why was direct faecal smear (wet mount) method used despite its known low sensitivity in the initial screening?16. Specify which floatation techniques were used and how they were done? Magnification used, salts used and their concentration as well as preparation methods17. McMaster technique should have been used to screen all the samples as it is relatively more sensitive than the other floatation methods, explain why this was not done18. What do you mean by intestines being removed aseptically in a dead chicken?19. Describe how the intestines were scraped and examined? Why didn't you use impression smears?20. How long did the sporulation take? Why was it important that you do it, how did you use this information to identify the Eimeria species21. Prevalence is a categorical data (proportion), Chi-square is more suited for this comparison22. Result section is poorly written and confusing as details that are supposed to be under materials and methods are mixed with results. P-values and X² are given below the tables but we don't know what they are comparing. Need a thorough reorganization23. Provide distinguishing features used to identify the different Eimeria species24. Where have you used the information collected by the questionnaire?	Yes thanks Noted and revised as per the suggestions.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Remove the old references used (at least use references from 2010)	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Poorly written, a lot of grammatical mistakes, poor flow	Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Italicize all scientific names2. Stick with one term, preferably "chicken" rather than interchanging between poultry, birds and chicken.3. When determining the prevalence, key aspects author should attention to are the sampling method (must be random and representative), sample size (must be adequate and formula provided), criteria for selection of sampling sites/areas must be given and for inclusion/exclusion from the study, the most appropriate method of screening should be used (molecular methods are ideal) or the most sensitive alternative method. All of these key aspects were not observed in by the author(s).	Thanks for the comments. Revised as per the suggestions

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	