

Name:	<u>UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4162
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular diagnosis with histological study of Eimeria spp. (Camelus dromedaries) at AL-Najaf AL-Ashraf provinces
Type of the Article	RESEARCH ARTICLE

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 combination of molecular diagnosis (precise identification) and histological study (Confirms the presence of <i>Eimeria</i> parasites within host tissues, aiding in the accurate assessment of infection intensity and tissue damage) of <i>Eimeria spp.</i> in <i>Camelus dromedaries</i> is a valuable tool for understanding of this parasitic disease, aiding in developing effective control measures, and improving the health and welfare of camels. Also controlling <i>Eimeria</i> infections can help prevent economic losses associated with reduced productivity and animal mortality.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is better to be; A Molecular and histological diagnosis of <i>Eimeria spp.</i> (<i>Camelus dromedaries</i>) at AL-Najaf AL-Ashraf provinces	
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.	It is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this		

<p>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.</p>		
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, 17</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Needs revision</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The molecular part is good with samples scoring accession numbers.</p> <p>It needs more detailed about sequence analysis and comparison to construct phylogenetic tree. Also 18S, since it is a coding gene more work can be exerted by predicting the protein sequence for accurate characterization of the parasite</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mona Abdelrahman Mohamed Khaier
Department, University & Country	University of Bahri, Sudan