SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

| Journal Name: | International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health |
|--------------------------|--|
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJTDH_45844 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | IN VITRO ANTIPARASITIC ACTIVITY OF CAMEL MILK AGAINST BLASTOCYSTIS SP. |
| 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)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments | The authors describe the bactericidal activity using a simple parasitic cell count after exposure to treatment or control without ever specifying if it is a vital count. The methodology described for the evaluation of toxicity is too simple, vitality tests should be performed with XTT assays (see reference reported below) or accurate counts through cytofluorimetric test (FACS). | |
| | A Rapid, High-Throughput Viability Assay for Blastocystis spp. Reveals Metronidazole Resistance and Extensive Subtype-Dependent Variations in Drug Susceptibilities. Haris Mirza, Joshua D. W. Teo, Jacqui Upcroft, Kevin S. W. Tan Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2011 Feb; 55(2): 637–648. Published online 2010 Nov 22. doi: 10.1128/AAC.00900-10 | |
| | Moreover the test never uses camel's milk deriving from different lactation states, like colostrum, that should exert the maximum protective effect. | |
| | Finally, camel Lf or from other mammals wasn't never tested, although the authors in the discussion make wide connection to the possible protective role of this protein. | |
| | For the above mentioned reasons the work cannot be accepted in the present form. It can be reconsidered after extensive revision and after doing the suggested experiments. | |
| Minor REVISION comments | Throughout the text the terms in vivo and in vitro must be written in italics | |
| Optional/General comments | | |
| | | |

PART 2:

| | | 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: | Francesco Giansanti |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Department, University & Country | University of L'Aquila, Italy |

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)