

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_121307
Title of the Manuscript:	Metabolic Changes on Freshwater vector Snail Lymnaea acuminata, due to aqueous extracts of stem bark and leaf of molluscicidal plant Phyllanthus niruri.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	To my Knowledge,the current manuscript will hopefully gives information regarding treatment of endemic fascioliasis in cattle.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	For the following seven days, this water was replaced every 24 hours. Following that, biochemical parameters were assessed in various snail tissues. (Can be removed from the abstract part)	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this 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.	In Conclusion part,the author can include few more points explaining the resulting values and the importance of the present work done. The current manuscript briefs the aqueous extracts of stem bark and leaf of P. niruri which can be used as a potent source of molluscicides in less cost.This article will definitely refered and will be be helpful overcome in non-target animals when compared to synthetic molluscicides.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Yes:For Research Paper to be published at least the author must refer 50 standard articles to improve the quality of research.In the current manuscript I strongly recommend author to increase the number of the references.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Average communication	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	M.Prashanthi Evangelin
Department, University & Country	Acharya Nagarjuna University, India