



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_29262
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF ANTIMALARIAL EFFICACY OF BERGENIA CILIATA (SAXIFRAGACEAE) LEAF EXTRACT: AN IN VITRO AND IN VIVO STUDY
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>)



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	A major revision to reflect exactly what was done even beginning with the abstract is needful. A casual look may give the impression this was conducted in humans bearing in mind the conclusion. The conclusion may be misleading because of the danger of direct projection or translation to humans. Concluding that the traditional usage of the plant for treating fever.... in humans or in mice?...is supported by the present study without any side effects on liver and kidney of host.... caution should be exercised in making such pronouncements. Abstract: line 1..."has been evaluated for its in vitro and in vivo antiplasmodium activity". Is that suppose to be..."is being evaluated? The next sentence states ..."study also explores.." Methodology: Line 4...repository and efficacy...were not was tested... Abstract also refers to P.falciparum but text has P.berghei for the in vivo antiplasmodial efficacy. Results and discussion also stated that: "The present study investigates the antimalaria activity of the ELEBC against both P.falciparum in vitro as well as it's preventive and curative potential in vivo. There appears to be a general mix up between this study reported here and previous study by the same Authors as cited. Previous study that was cited is noted. There is a need for proper corrections. 2.4 Parasite strain NK-65.....for in vivo study? Check abstract! 2.8.1 (G4 -G7) line 2 and 2.8.2 (G4-G7) line 5	The suggested changes have been incorporated in the abstract. The conclusion of the abstract has been changed. The study tests the <i>in vitro</i> activity of the extract against <i>P. falciparum</i> and <i>in vivo</i> against <i>P. berghei</i>. As suggested, parasite strain for both <i>in vitro</i> and <i>in vivo</i> studies has been specified in the abstract as well as in the text. The current study aims to test the activity of the extract against <i>Plasmodium falciparum</i> and its antimalarial potential as a preventive and curative remedy against <i>P. berghei</i> infection. Further the study reports the safety of the extract on liver and kidney function of the rodent host. In the previous study, only the <i>in vitro</i> activity was tested against <i>P. berghei</i> and its <i>in vivo</i> suppressive activity was assessed. So present study is not a replica of the original work rather it reports <i>in vitro</i> activity of the extract against CQ sensitive (MRC-2) and resistant (RKL-9) strains of human malaria parasite <i>P. falciparum</i> along with its preventive and curative potential against rodent malaria parasite. Both the strains of <i>P. falciparum</i> (MRC-2 and RKL-9) used for testing the efficacy of the extract <i>in vitro</i> and NK-65 strain of <i>P. berghei</i> used for assessment of <i>in vivo</i> preventive and curative activities have been specified in



SDI Review Form 1.6

	How can they be differentiated? Results and discussion:..." Previous study...good in vitro and in vivo ref 5" Previous study is first mentioned in the result of the current study... Why? Page 9 "These findings illustrate that higher doses are able to prevent parasite development during early stages of infection...HOWEVER THEY ARE TOXIC (should be noted)...while lower doses" The conclusion within the body reflected both <i>P.falciparum</i> and <i>P.berghei</i>. Appropriate revision is suggested for the abstract and possibly the title of the study to forestall any ambiguity. Revision: References- ref 2 "Schopke" spelling; ref 4 year after Authors to be deleted; ref 10 confirm volume; ref 12 Author? Page numbers; ref 18 last name and initials please; refs 20 and 23 please confirm. General: please check the tenses. Plagiarism: However I request and affirm the need for expression of caution in projecting studies in animals to humans.	section 2.4. In section 2.8.1 (G4 -G7) line 2; the ELEBC treated groups have now been changed to (GP4-GP7) for the preventive test, which were treated with the extract before inoculation with the parasite stain to test its ability to prevent malaria. In 2.8.2 (G4-G7) line 5: shows the ELEBC treated groups for the curative test in which the mice were infected on D0 and the infection was allowed to establish for 4 days. Thereafter, the mice were treated with the extract to check the ability of the extract to cure the established infection. As suggested the beginning of Results and discussion section has been reframed. The reference of previous study results have been mentioned later in the results of the current study as it is a continuation of the previous study in which only the <i>in vivo</i> suppressive activity of ELEBC was evaluated and the <i>in vitro</i> efficacy was tested against rodent malaria parasite <i>P. berghei</i>. Page 9, the sentence has been reframed as suggested. The title as well the abstract has been revised. As suggested: • The references have been corrected. • The manuscript has been checked for grammatical errors. The manuscript has been checked for plagiarism using turnitin software. The study reports the promising efficacy of the extract against the human malaria parasite <i>Plasmodium falciparum</i>. However, in order to be used as a phytomedicine for humans the
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		extract needs to be evaluated in clinical trials.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		