



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>The title is consistent with the work and agrees with the objective and conclusion.</p> <p>The keywords are sufficient, they contemplate the work and will indicate what is mentioned in the online search engines.</p> <p>The introduction provides a concise overview, presents the problem involved in the research, deepens concepts and lists comparative results, justifying the need for these works and when revealing the research objective determines the focus of the respective essay. I didn't find plagiarism.</p> <p>As for the materials and methods, there is clarity in the techniques adopted and their respective execution protocol. In addition, each work methodology adopted was based on the citation of other works / authors. With regard to data analysis, the use of the T test is a good choice because trials with up to 4 treatments are not as penalized by the incorporation of type I error.</p> <p>The results were presented clearly and making the most of the data obtained with the test. In addition, the presentation of intervals between the extremes clarifies the data a lot.</p> <p>In the discussion, the authors' intention to explain how the health system is doing is observed. The clarification of the biological, biochemical, physiological effects, etc. clarifies why everything happens. Every job seems to be fine.</p> <p>The conclusion is direct and concise, it is in agreement with the title and objective of the work and still draws attention to the need for further study. Thus fulfilling, with what is expected from a conclusion of scientific work.</p> <p>Thus, the referred work is publishable, leaving adjustments to the references.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>References 5, 7, 8, 9 and 13 are not following the same pattern as the others (name contraction, repeated words and contraction of the journal's name). More than half of the references are less than 10 years old from publication and are good works, from well-known journals.</p>	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fábio Tonissi Moroni
Department, University & Country	Brazil