

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_129176
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>In Vitro</i> Anthelmintic Activity of Mahaneem ( <i>Melia azedarach</i> ) and Chirata ( <i>Swertia chirata</i> ) extracts against eggs and adult stage of <i>Haemonchus contortus</i>
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript is of great importance to the scientific community, as it explores natural and sustainable solutions for parasite control in small ruminants, which is crucial for animal health and livestock production. The research offers an alternative to conventional anthelmintic drugs, which can be expensive and lead to resistance in parasites. In addition, the study highlights the potential effectiveness of medicinal plants, opening paths for future research in veterinary medicine and phytotherapy. I like this manuscript because it provides valuable data and applies a rigorous scientific approach, with promising results that can have a positive impact on veterinary practice and animal health management.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	I suggest: "Evaluation of the <i>in vitro</i> anthelmintic activity of <i>Melia azedarach</i> and <i>Swertia chirata</i> extracts against <i>Haemonchus contortus</i> ".	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract of the article is quite complete, but it is always possible to improve it, which, I suggest including a brief reference to the statistical methods used to analyze the data, to give more credibility to the study.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically correct in terms of methodology, study design and results obtained, including some positive aspects, such as: Clear objective: The study has a clear and well-defined objective, which is to evaluate the anthelmintic activity of two plants. Study design: The methodology is well detailed, including the preparation of extracts and the trials performed. Detailed results: The results are presented with specific data and statistical analysis, which gives it credibility. Data-driven conclusions: Conclusions are supported by the data obtained, which is fundamental in scientific research.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	References are sufficient, although it needs to be updated a little more. In addition, the bibliographic citations of references number 17, 19 and 22 do not appear and reference number 1 the year does not coincide with the bibliographic citation. I suggest analyzing and correcting what has been pointed out. It must maintain homogeneity in the citations, that is, maintain the same form of citation, as, for example, (Zarlenga et al., 2016) and (Hernández-Villegas et al., 2011), I suggest maintaining the first form, which coincides with the rest of the bibliographic citations.	

**Review Form 3**

<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The quality of the language/English of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>In the introduction, he must correct the word "In viitro", which is written in italics and as follows: <i>in vitro</i>. The figure and table 1 used in the manuscript that are in the subsection of materials and methods, I suggest to change them for the subsection of results and discussion, both of which denote expression of results.</p> <p>I suggest analyzing in Figure 2 the expression "morola stage", which is expressed "morula stage". I suggest that the identification of table 1 found in the subsection of results and discussion, should appear at the top of the table and not separately.</p> <p>There are no conflicting topics of interest in this manuscript. There is no suspicion of plagiarism in this manuscript.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b><u>Reviewer's comment</u></b>	<b><u>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)</u></b>
<b><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></b>	<b><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></b>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Nelson Correa Herrera</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>Universidad de Ciego de Ávila "Máximo Gómez Báez", Cuba</b>