

ReviewForm2

BookName:	InnovationsinBiologicalScience
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_BPR_2249
Titleofthe Manuscript:	ExperimentalStudiesonDomesticCatasaDefinitiveHostofSpirometraspecies
Typeofthe Article	Bookchapter

PART1:ReviewComments

CompulsoryREVISIONcomments	Reviewer’scomment	Author’s Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlightthatpartinthe manuscript.Itismandatorythat authorsshouldwritehis/herfeedbackhere)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike)thismanuscript?Aminimumof3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript offers a valuable contribution to the understanding of Spirometra's life cycle by definitively establishing the domestic cat as a definitive host. This research fills a gap in knowledge and provides a foundation for further investigations into the epidemiology and controlofthisparasite.Whilethestudydesignissound,expandingthesamplesizeand incorporating molecular techniques for species identification would strengthen the overall impact of the findings.	
Isthethitleof thearticlesuitable? (Ifnotplease suggestanalternativetitle)	The title "Experimental Studies on Domestic Cat as a Definitive Host of Spirometra species" is suitable. It clearly and concisely states the purpose and scope of the research. It effectively conveys the experimental nature of the study and the focus on determining the cat's role as a definitive host for Spirometra.	

ReviewForm2

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 is generally comprehensive, providing a clear overview of the study. It effectively summarizes the objective, methodology, key findings, and conclusion. However, a minor improvement could be made by explicitly stating the samples size of the cats used in the study. This would provide readers with a clearer understanding of the study's scope. Additionally, considering the inclusion of specific <i>Spirometra</i> species, if identified, would enhance the abstract's precision. For example, the abstract could be revised to include: "A total of 5 domestic cats were used..." and, if applicable, "...confirmed that domestic cats are definitive hosts of <i>Spirometra</i> species (or the specific species identified)."	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript follows a standard and appropriate structure. It adheres to the typical IMRAD format (Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, and Discussion), which is widely recognized in scientific writing. The subsections within each section are also logical and well-organized, facilitating easy understanding of the research process and findings. Overall, the structure enhances the readability and clarity of the manuscript.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its clear objective and hypothesis, controlled experiments with appropriate methodology, data collection through established methods, and analysis and interpretation based on scientific principles. Here's a breakdown of the strengths: - The study clearly aims to determine if domestic cats are definitive hosts of <i>Spirometra</i> species. This objective is directly addressed through the experiment design. - The experiment involves feeding cats with spargana from infected frogs and hamsters, which serves as a controlled way to investigate the development of spargana into adult worms in cats. - The manuscript mentions collecting eggs from feces and recovering adult worms post-sacrifice, both of which are standard methods for studying parasite life cycles. - The author compares his findings on worm morphology with established knowledge of <i>Spirometra</i> species, demonstrating a data-driven approach. Overall, the manuscript adheres to scientific best practices, strengthening the credibility of its findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	To further strengthen the paper, consider incorporating more recent studies (within the last 5-10 years) on <i>Spirometra</i>, especially those focusing on the role of domestic cats as definitive hosts. This would demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the current state of knowledge in the field. Additionally, exploring studies on the prevalence of <i>Spirometra</i> infections in domestic cat populations could provide valuable context for the research.	

ReviewForm2

MinorREVISION comments Isthelanguage/Englishqualityofthearticle suitable for scholarly communications?	The writing exhibits clarity, conciseness, and overall adherence to academic traditions. Theutilization of specialized terminology is fitting, and the entire delivery is polished. Nevertheless,thereexistafewnegligibleaspects thatcouldbenefitfrom enhancements: • Certainsentencesmightberearrangedtoenhanceclarityandcoherence.Forinstance, contemplate the act of dissecting excessively lengthy statements into more concise ones. • Someinstancesofwordchoicemightbeimprovedtoenhanceprecision.Utilizingmore precise terminology rather than broad ones can improve clarity, as seen by this example. • Thereareminorgrammaticalflaws,suchasproblemwithsubject-verbagreementor inappropriate punctuation. Thoroughly proofreading can resolve these issues. Ingeneral,the language qualityissatisfactory,andtheseideasareintendedtoenhancethe clarity and effectiveness of the article.	
Optional/Generalcomments	The paper presents a straightforward experimental design to investigate the role of domestic catsasdefinitivehostsforSpirometraspecies.Theauthorssuccessfullydemonstratedthatcats can indeed harbor adult Spirometra worms, producing eggs, and thus confirming their role in the parasite's life cycle.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Carmela G. Blando
Department, University & Country	College of Agriculture, Quirino State University, Philippines