



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_49444
Title of the Manuscript:	IDENTIFICATION OF ESSENTIAL THERAPEUTIC TARGETS ON <i>Toxoplasma gondii</i> PARASITE TO COMBAT TOXOPLASMOSIS
Type of the Article	Review 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>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title is best written as 'THERAPEUTIC TARGETS ON TOXOPLASMA GONDII PARASITE IN COMBATTING TOXOPLASMOSIS'. 2. Even Narrative Reviews must be structured in Introduction, Aim, Material and Methods, Results and Discussion and Conclusion. In the same manner the Abstract. 3. Under Material and Methods, you need to outline the manner you searched to obtain relevant literature, including citing the search-engine(s) used. In what languages were the selected-literature. What factors (criteria) were taken in account in selecting the articles (literature)? 4. Try to have not just one (mostly) or two references in what you cite. Try to annotate additional references in each – including contrasting views. Such would differentiate an essay from a Narrative Review. 5. My remaining Comments towards Revision are found highlighted yellow in the attached accompanying Manuscript text. 	<p>Thank you very much for your kind suggestions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors agreed with you on the suggested title for the article and this has been highlighted on the main article. 2. This article is a narrative review, and though the search procedure was also systematically conducted, the authors feel that any alteration may not be possible at this stage. 3. Many references were cited depending on the availability of relevant study on the subject. 4. The comments were responded to accordingly and in line with what is available in the literature.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Page 3.	<p>These criteria, if strictly adhered to, in drug development against <i>T. gondii</i>, issues related to drug toxicity, immune evasion, and economic loss in the agricultural sector will be resolved.</p> <p>Note:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Immune evasion in toxoplasmosis is the capability of the parasite to escape the effects of the host's immune responses. 2. For the economic loss, we mean the loss of production in agricultural sector because toxoplasmosis is a problem in the livestock industries
	Page 7.	The article was explaining the prevention and prophylaxis efficacy of the vaccine made from CDPK6/ROP18, not the treatment.

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)	Not Applicable