



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_56200
Title of the Manuscript:	In-vitro Anthelmintic Activity of Chitosan Encapsulated Bromelain against eggs, larval and adult stages of Haemonchus contortus
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>ABSTRACT I understood the subdivision of the abstract in: Introduction, objective, methodology, results and conclusion. Thus, in the introductory part I recommend summarizing, emphasizing the novelty of your study, the nanoencapsulated. It gets more interesting. Draws the reader's attention to your work. The methodology was vague, describe this information: -How was the process of isolation of bromelain? What about encapsulation? -Which tests were conducted to verify in vitro the anthelmintic activity on eggs, larvae and adults? In the results part, (if the difference was not statistically significant, it was not a difference. I suggest to repeat this sentence in the text) Describe the results for bromelain and also. Comment on the importance of <i>in vivo</i> encapsulation.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION Replace the phrase has "led to parasite resistance to anthelmintic drugs" for "Select resistant strains"</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS -In the topical "Extraction of bromelain", Insert GPS location and talk about climatic aspects of the collection area. Insert the scientific name of the species and tipping in a herbarium.-In "Egg Hatch Assay". Plain extracted bromelain, bromelain (Sigma-Aldrich) (what concentration were tested at? Describe here.)-In "Data Analysis" Microsoft office excel version, year and maker?</p> <p>RESULTS - 2.5.2 SEM (describe the acronym) analysis - FIGURE 3: Change the graph, mg / mL and the statistical analysis (signaling significant differences between the means). Bromelain and bromelain and between extracted bromelain and commercially bought bromelain. However, there were significant (P <0.05) differences in egg hatch inhibition between Albendazole and encapsulated bromelain. Without the significance of the graph, it cannot be said. If they are statistically equal, it cannot be said that they are different.</p> <p>TABLE 1: Remove vertical lines from the table. There was no statistical analysis, differences between values. FIGURE 4: Change the graph, mg / mL and the statistical analysis (signaling significant differences between the means). TABLE 2: Remove vertical lines from the table. There was no statistical analysis, differences between values.</p> <p>FIGURE 5: Change the graph, mg / mL and the statistical analysis (signaling significant differences between the means).</p> <p>TABLE 3: Remove vertical lines from the table There was no statistical analysis, differences between values.</p> <p>DISCUSSION -In the second pagrafre, line 6, replace "1C50" for "IC50".</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	The encapsulation process did not change the properties of the enzyme. That's nice! Highlight! Comment that in the animal, the activity can be superior, because the drug will be delivered and protected.	
Optional/General comments	Congratulations on the work. Review all the text, emphasizing the importance of using natural compounds and encapsulation. It makes it more interesting for the reader.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ana Raquel Carneiro Ribeiro
Department, University & Country	Brazil