

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_94997
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Study on Therapeutic Efficacy of Different Anthelmintics in Treatment of Swamp Buffalo Naturally Infested with Gastro-intestinal Parasites
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:

(<https://journalsajp.com/index.php/SAJP/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		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u> 	<p>Yes, such studies are required to be carried out and to report regularly in order to assess the status of anthelmintic resistance and proper management of worms</p> <p>Revision is required as marked</p> <p>Re organization is required</p> <p>No, need to reassemble the findings</p> <p>To some extent Too lengthy for such a short and common study, need to be reduced drastically (maximum to 10)</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Introduction should be in brief Avoid repetition and unrelated sentences</p>	
Optional/General comments		
	The MS can be accepted as SHORT COMMUNICATION after proper and thorough revision.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	C P Swarnkar
Department, University & Country	ICAR-Central Sheep and Wool Research Institute, India