

SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	AJRIZ/147702
Title of the Manuscript:	Bidirectional influence of Helminths on Carcinogenesis in Humans: An Overview
Type of Article :	Review Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>While the literature search strategy states inclusion and exclusion criteria and a thorough review was conducted, crucial details necessary for replicating the systematic approach are missing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Database Specification: The search utilized a "structured search of biomedical databases", but the identity of these specific databases (e.g., PubMed, Google Scholar, Web of Science etc.) is not provided. 2. Search Term Documentation: The article lists keywords, but the exact search strings used in the database searches are not detailed, limiting the ability of readers to assess the comprehensiveness of the literature retrieval. 3. Time Constraints: The review should define the specific start and end dates of the literature search window to ensure transparency regarding the timeliness and cut-off point of the compiled data. 4. The current organization does not fully integrate the "bidirectional influence" promised by the title, particularly regarding the anti-cancer data: The section on "Inhibitory Effects on Tumorigenesis" should be moved earlier or structured in parallel with the carcinogenic mechanism sections. Presenting the opposing roles sequentially downplays the duality and makes the article feel top-heavy with carcinogenicity data. 5. The figures (Fig. 1, Fig. 2, Fig. 3) and tables (Table 1) are essential explanatory components of the text, summarizing IARC classifications, chronic inflammation pathways, and immune modulation. They must be incorporated directly into the body of the article immediately following their first citation, rather than being relegated to an Appendix. 	

PART 3: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS for this REVISED manuscript
<p>Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this REVISED manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0)</p> <p>Guideline: Accept (8-10) Revision required: (4-8) Rejected: (0-4)</p>	<p>Revision required but it should be accepted when structured properly. So I will give "7" as a score for now.</p>