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	The structure of the article suggests that it should probably be classified as Minireview

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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: <u>https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/</u> Benefits for Reviewers: <u>https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers</u>

PART 1: 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. 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	

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 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.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct to some extent, and it is not structured in according to the regulations of a proper scientific text. - 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. 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 topic) and is not interpreted at all in the parts of the text regarding the epidemiology of giardiasis.	

	- 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.	
Are the references sufficient	As described above, the appropriate references regarding the	
and recent? If you have	topic "Giardiasis in Philippines" are not sufficient enough for a	
suggestions of additional	specialized minireview as this manuscript is proposed.	
references, please mention	Even a very basic (google) search outside specific scientific	
them in the review form.	databases using only the two keywords "giardiasis" and	
	"Philippines" listed several articles that are not included as	
	citations, regarding:	
	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	
	Water sourses:	
	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.	
	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	
	Velante NAP, Oronan RB, Reyes MF, Divina BP. Giardia	
	duodenalis in Captive Tigers (Panthera tigris), Palawan	
	Bearcats (Arctictis binturong whitei) and Asian Palm Civet	
	(Paradoxurus hermaphroditus) at a Wildlife Facility in Manila,	
	Philippines. Iran J Parasitol. 2017 Jul-Sep;12(3):348-354.	
	PMID: 28979344; PMCID: PMC5623914.	
	A more comprehensive specialized search, that should be	

	fundamentally the aim and the essence of the proposed manuscript, could reveal even other pertinent sources.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language quality is suitable.	
Optional/General 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.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kalina Stoyanova Pavlova
Department, University & Country	Medical University of Varna, Bulgaria