

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian journal of parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_91981
Title of the Manuscript:	Anthelmintic activities on <i>Heligmosomoides bakeri</i> (Nematoda, Heligmosomatidae) of <i>Alafia barteri</i> 's stem bark (Apocynaceae) administrated in the form of drinkable suspension of extracts (aqueous and ethanolic)
Type of the 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:

<https://www.journalbjournal.com/index.php/BJI/editorial-policy>

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	The theme approached in this paper falls into the topic of Biotechnology Journal International. The paper has a clarity of informations. There is a logic thread of the presentation and argumentation which makes the paper relatively easy crossing. The used language is scientifically correct, and it can be easily read and understood by the specialists in the studied field. The style and expression of the authors are clear and coherent, no expression mistakes. The paper contains 33 bibliographical sources, of which: one work is published in 2021, four in 2020 and four before 2000. Their citation is made according to requirements.	
Minor REVISION comments	The title of the paper should be simplified, possibly giving up the round brackets with details. The Abstract section is too detailed and thus contains too many words. In Conclusion section, the contributions of the authors in this paper should have been more clearly highlighted. In pages 4-7 and 9-10, the indentation at the beginning of the paragraphs in the text is missing. It is necessary to number the sections and subsections of the paper. The relationship for <i>EPG</i> on page 5 is not clear. In the relationship for <i>FECR</i> on page 5, the letter c appears, but in the related explanations, the capital letter C is used. The relationship for <i>FECR</i> on page 5 and the relationship for <i>TWCR</i> on page 6 must be written separately from the text, like the formulas for <i>EPG</i> and <i>LDR</i> . The four previously mentioned relationships should be written centered on the page and numbered on the right side of the page. The works listed in the References section are numbered.	
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:	Blajina Ovidiu
Department, University & Country	University Politehnica of Bucharest, Romania