

Review Form 2

Book Name:	Innovations in Biological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2266
Title of the Manuscript:	Experimental Studies on Hamster mice as a Paratenic host of Spirometraspargana
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The experimental studies are very important for parasite -related researches, especially in terms of biology of parasites. <i>Spirometra</i> tapeworm has the complicated life cycle with the join of two intermediate hosts and a large range of paratenic hosts, almost of them are natural hosts. Hence, the selection of a laboratory animal for experimental studies is important. This manuscript could be accepted after improving some points.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should be changed as “Study on hamster mice served as an experimentally paratenic host of <i>Spirometra</i> tapeworm”.	
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 first sentence and the last sentence were repeated. The first sentence should be describe “what the aim of this study is” The English should be improved. For example: the word “experimentally” should be deleted in the second sentence. “On 30th and 120th days post infection.”: not complete sentence “Sites of predilection”: of what The word “Hamster” or “hamster” should be written uniformly through the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The method: The method part sometime was confused to results. For example: “Sites where spargana were recovered were recorded as shown in (Table1). A total of 15 spargana were recovered from 9 hamster mice and one hamster mice was negative” should be written in result part. The method should be separated into “method of experimental infection in hamster mice” and “method of recovery <i>Spirometraspargana</i> from hamster mice”. Spargana needed to be measured before being infection. The result: Table 1 and 2 contained too much raw data. Table 1 and 2 should be combined. Graph 1 and 2 were not necessary The figure didn't show the size of bar. The result should compare the size of spargana before and after being infected to know whether spargana develop into hamster mice, and the data of size of spargana will be more meaningful. The discussion: The authors should explain why you design the experimental infection with different number of spargana for each mouse, and why the number of spargana recovered were lower than that of spargana prepared for study (15 compared to 22) in stead of explanation of the posture of mice.	

Review Form 2

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.	This is perhaps the first study on the role of hamster mice served as a paratenic host for Spirometra	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It is necessary to add/update more recent references, the references used in this study were too old.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English should be improved so much. Authors should check the grammar, spelling, the structure of sentences, plural/single noun... For examples: “if hamster mice was” (in the abstract), “was” = were, “Normal Saline”, “When the Hamster mice were resting” (in the discussion). “Most of the larvae from these hamster mice infected with spargana from naturally infected frogs in the laboratory were recovered from the neck region”: subject is too long “There is a visible connection between the frog and snake as the snakes prey on them”.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Nguyen Thi Hoang Yen
Department, University & Country	Vietnam National University of Agriculture, Vietnam