



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_68272
Title of the Manuscript:	Anti-giardial activity Capparis spinosa Linn leaf and fruit extracts on Giardia lamblia cysts
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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	<p>The manuscript tests the action of extract of the leaf and the fruit of <i>Capparis spinosa</i> on cysts of <i>Giardia</i>. The results found are interesting and show that the extracts are capable of inducing cell death of the cysts with a dose and time-dependent response. However, the authors suggest the future use of this compound for the treatment of human giardiasis. During infection the evolutionary form is the trophozoite. Therefore, this form should be the target of therapeutic candidates. Thus, the manuscript's approach needs to be redone.</p> <p>I suggest that the use of extracts be considered as candidates for the elimination of environmental cysts, which would be extremely important to treat potential sources of contamination. <i>Giardia</i> cysts are known to be resistant to chlorine and common disinfectants. Thus, other ways of eliminating cysts are still needed.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1- The strategy used to identify cysts in the stool sample has very low sensitivity. And many samples may have been lost.</p> <p>2- It is important to add in the graphs the positive and negative controls used, so that it is possible to verify that the differences observed are really the result of the action of the extracts.</p> <p>3- Statistical differences must be calculated between the same concentrations at different times and between different concentrations at the same time.</p> <p>4- Review references</p> <p>"<i>Giardia lamblia</i> is one of the most common pathogenic protozoa causing giardiasis. and its annual prevalence was estimated about 280 million people worldwide [1]." - In this review this survey is not carried out.</p> <p>"Giardia cysts were transmitted through the consumption of contaminated water and food [2]." - This discovery is not a recent one, nor was it made by these authors. This information is already consolidated and it is notorious to know, therefore, it does not need to be referenced.</p>	
Optional/General comments	The results found in the study are interesting but are not in the proper approach.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Maria Fantinatti Fernandes da Silva</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Instituto Oswaldo Cruz, Brazil</i>