

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4529
Title of the Manuscript:	Giardia duodenalis in the Philippines: Its Prevalence, Impact, and Diagnostic Challenges
Type of the Article	<i>The structure of the article suggests that it should probably be classified as Minireview</i>

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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 manuscript is a minireview on the problem of Giardia infection in the Philippines. It addresses the important topics of neglected parasitic diseases in parts of the world, where they still have serious impact on human health, especially in children. The manuscript has the potential to summarise the information regarding the prevalence of giardiasis in this region and to address its diagnostic and therapeutic challenges.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should reflect better the structure of the text, for instance: <i>Giardia duodenalis</i> in the Philippines: prevalence, epidemiology, and diagnostic and treatment challenges	

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive, but to improve its quality changes are needed for it to represent better the following text of the manuscript. The general (introduction) part in the abstract is unnecessary long, and the part about the actual topic (giardiasis in Philippines) is unproportionally small.</p>	<p>Accepted. Relevant corrections have been incorporated into the revised manuscript.</p>
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically correct to some extent, and it is not structured in according to the regulations of a proper scientific text.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Even a narrative minireview, such as this, must contain a Material and methods part to explain the process of gathering of the literature sources. The authors have to specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria, used databases and keywords. There must be a specific time frame - the period for this retrospective research and so on. - There is not defined aim/purpose of the study. - The INTRODUCTION, similarly, to the abstract, is unnecessary long and it contains information that is repeated later in the other paragraphs of the text. - The section PATHOGENESIS AND TRANSMISSION is scientifically more connected with the EPIDEMIOLOGY section and should follow it logically. - In the sections EPIDEMIOLOGY OF GIARDIASIS IN THE PHILIPPINES and PATHOGENESIS AND TRANSMISSION – the prevalence rates for the Philippines are reported from only two regional studies [7, 8] and two studies about the environmental factors [17, 19]. This limited amount of only four sources, actually relevant to the topic “Giardiasis in Philippines” is insufficient for a review article of this scale. The extended discussions, interpretations and conclusions based on only these four studies are not entirely derived from specific results and are sometimes assumptive. <p>Furthermore, a relevant and interesting study about co-parasitism of intestinal protozoa (reference 9) in Philippines is cited scarcely (two times outside of its main</p>	<p>Comment: The manuscript is scientifically correct to some extent, but it is not structured according to the regulations of a proper scientific text.</p> <p>Response: We appreciate the feedback. In the revised manuscript, we have restructured the content to align more closely with the standard scientific format, ensuring clarity and adherence to conventional scientific writing practices.</p> <p>Comment: Even a narrative mini-review, such as this, must contain a Material and Methods part to explain the process of gathering the literature sources. The authors should specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria, used databases, and keywords, and define a specific time frame for this retrospective research.</p> <p>Response: We appreciate the reviewer’s suggestion regarding the inclusion of a Materials and Methods section. While we did not incorporate a traditional Materials and Methods section, we opted to focus on providing a comprehensive outline of the sources reviewed. In the revised manuscript, we have ensured that the process of gathering literature, including the databases searched, keywords, and inclusion/exclusion criteria, is clearly outlined within the narrative. Additionally, a specific time frame for the literature considered has been incorporated,</p>

	<p>topic) and is not interpreted at all in the parts of the text regarding the epidemiology of giardiasis.</p> <p>- The sections DIAGNOSTIC METHODS FOR GIARDIASIS and TREATMENT AND VACCINE are scientifically relevant and represent accurately the current “state of the science” and the problems existing in developing countries such as Philippines.</p>	<p>ensuring transparency and clarity in the review methodology.</p> <p>Comment: There is no defined aim/purpose of the study.</p> <p>Response: We have now included a clear statement of the study's aim and purpose at the end of the introduction section, providing readers with a precise understanding of the scope and objectives of the review.</p> <p>Comment: The introduction is unnecessarily long and contains information that is repeated later in the other sections.</p> <p>Response: We have revised the introduction to streamline the content, removing repetitive details and ensuring that it effectively introduces the key topics of the manuscript without unnecessary length.</p> <p>Comment: The section “Pathogenesis and Transmission” is scientifically more connected with the “Epidemiology” section and should follow it logically.</p> <p>Response: We have reorganized the manuscript, moving the "Pathogenesis and Transmission" section to follow immediately after the "Epidemiology" section to improve logical flow and cohesion between these related topics.</p> <p>Comment: In the sections “Epidemiology of Giardiasis in the Philippines” and “Pathogenesis and Transmission,” the prevalence rates for the Philippines are reported from only two regional studies and two studies about environmental factors. This limited amount of sources is insufficient for a</p>
--	---	--

		<p>review article of this scale.</p> <p>Response: We acknowledge the limitation of sources and have expanded the literature review. We incorporated additional studies relevant to the epidemiology of giardiasis in the Philippines, addressing the gaps and providing a more comprehensive analysis.</p> <p>Comment: A relevant study on co-parasitism of intestinal protozoa (reference 9) is cited sparsely and not interpreted in the epidemiology sections.</p> <p>Response: We have now integrated the study on co-parasitism more thoroughly within the epidemiology section, discussing its relevance to giardiasis in the Philippines and interpreting its findings in the context of the review.</p> <p>Comment: The sections “Diagnostic Methods for Giardiasis” and “Treatment and Vaccine” are scientifically relevant and accurately represent the current state of science, especially regarding issues faced by developing countries like the Philippines.</p> <p>Response: Thank you for the positive feedback. We have retained and slightly expanded these sections to ensure they reflect the most recent advancements and challenges in diagnostic methods, treatment, and vaccine development, particularly within the context of the Philippines.</p>
--	--	--

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>As described above, the appropriate references regarding the topic “Giardiasis in Philippines” are not sufficient enough for a specialized minireview as this manuscript is proposed.</p> <p>Even a very basic (google) search outside specific scientific databases using only the two keywords “giardiasis” and “Philippines” listed several articles that are not included as citations, regarding:</p> <p>Human population: R.V. Labana, J.Z. Dungca, & V. Nissapatorn. (2018). Presence of Cryptosporidium and Giardia in the water sources of indigenous peoples in Boliwong, Philippines. Asian Pacific Journal of Health Sciences, 5(3), 163–166. https://doi.org/10.21276/apjhs.2018.5.3.21</p> <p>Water sources: Paller, V. G., Kim, P. M., Abadilla, M. E., Bordado, A. M., Galapon, M., Gamalo, L. E., & Macalinao, C. A. (2017). Prevalence of Cryptosporidium and Giardia in selected recreational pools in Calamba, Laguna, Philippines. Ecology, Environment and Conservation, 23(4), 1945–1951.</p> <p>Animal reservoirs: Paller, V.G.V., Mendoza, D.L.A. & Macaraig, J.R.M. Domesticated animal reservoirs of Cryptosporidium and Giardia in agricultural farms in Laguna and Quezon provinces, Philippines. J Parasit Dis 48, 485–492 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12639-024-01685-z</p> <p>Velante NAP, Oronan RB, Reyes MF, Divina BP. Giardia duodenalis in Captive Tigers (<i>Panthera tigris</i>), Palawan Bearcats (<i>Arctictis binturong whitei</i>) and Asian Palm Civet (<i>Paradoxurus hermaphroditus</i>) at a Wildlife Facility in Manila, Philippines. Iran J Parasitol. 2017 Jul-Sep;12(3):348-354. PMID: 28979344; PMCID: PMC5623914.</p> <p>A more comprehensive specialized search, that should be fundamentally the aim and the essence of the proposed manuscript, could reveal even other pertinent sources.</p>	<p>Response: We appreciate the reviewer’s observation regarding the inclusion of additional references. In response, we have expanded the literature review significantly by adding a comprehensive selection of references from 2007 to 2024. These references were carefully chosen to address the gaps in the previous version of the manuscript. We also conducted extensive searches using both specialized scientific databases and broader platforms to ensure that relevant studies, including those found using general search terms like "giardiasis" and "Philippines," were incorporated. This has allowed us to present a more exhaustive and up-to-date review of the topic, strengthening the manuscript’s coverage of giardiasis in the Philippines.</p>
---	--	---

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language quality is suitable.	Response: Thank you for the positive feedback on the quality of the English language in the manuscript. We are glad to hear that it meets the standards expected for clarity and readability.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is interesting and engages an important topic of public health concern for developing countries. Saying this, it would benefit greatly from a revision concerning the proper structure of a scientific text and extended and comprehensive reference search.	Response: We sincerely appreciate the positive feedback regarding the relevance of the manuscript to public health concerns in developing countries. We acknowledge the need for a more structured approach to scientific writing and an extended reference search. In the revised manuscript, we have focused on enhancing the structure to align with the standards of scientific text. Additionally, we have conducted an extensive and comprehensive review of recent studies, expanding the reference list from 2007 to 2024 to ensure a thorough and up-to-date analysis. These changes aim to provide a more structured and well-supported narrative that effectively addresses the topic.

PART 2:

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