SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJBCRR_21645**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Antimalarial Potentials of Leaf and Stem Bark Methanol Extracts of Diospyros mespiliformis on Plasmodium Berghei (Nk65) Infected Mice**
Type of the Article	**Research**

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	**I have revised the manuscript and it seems to be well done. The experimental part has been well conducted. However, this is not the first time that Diospyros mespiliformes has been studied for Antimalarial disease. This kind of work has been reported before for different authors and they are not cited in this one.** **I found at least 4 works and one thesis about Antimalarial effect of different parts of Diospyros mespiliformis:** **1) Ali A. Jigam, Usman T. Abdulrazaq, Rukkaya S. Suleiman and Patience S. Kali. Effects of Sub-Chronic Administration of Diospyros Mespiliformis Hochst (Ebenaceae) Root Extracts on Some Biochemical Parameters in Mice. Journal of Applied Pharmaceutical Science 02 (05); 2012: 60-64** **2) Bulus ADZU and Oluwakanyinsola Adeola SALAWU. Screening Diospyros mespiliformis extract for antimalarial potency. Int. J. Biol. Chem. Sci. 3(2): 271-276, 2009** **3) Ietidal E. Mohamed, El Bushra E. El Nur, Muhammad I. Choudhary and Shamsun N. Khan. Bioactive Natural Products from Two Sudanese Medicinal Plants Diospyros mespiliformis and Croton zambesicus. Rec. Nat. Prod. 3:4 (2009) 198-203.** **4) Tolu O. Odugbemi, Odunayo R. Akinsulire Ibukun E. Aibinu and Peter O. Fabeku. MEDICINAL PLANTS USEFUL FOR MALARIA THERAPY IN OKEIGBO, ONDO STATE, SOUTHWEST NIGERIA. Afr. J.**	Some of these references have been introduced into the manuscript. The difference with between my work and the manuscript by Adzu *et al*,2009 is that: 1. The extraction method (Liquid-Liquid partition separation) of the bioactive metabolite is much better. 2. I worked on two part of the plant (leaf and stem bark). 3. Mechanism of action of the plant was investigated

	Trad. CAM (2007) 4 (2): 191- 198. **5) IN VITRO ANTIPLASMODIAL ACTIVITY AND PHYTOCHEMICALS SCREENING OF ETHNOMEDICINAL PLANTS USED TO TREAT MALARIA ASSOCIATED SYMPTOMS. A THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA BY Sylvia Ndeshihafela Nafuka. Dr. D R. Mumbengegwi, (Multidisciplinary Research Center, University of Namibia) Co-supervisor: Dr. R. Böck, (Department of Biological Science, University of Namibia)** **Authors need to check these and other references and include them in the manuscript.** **Authors need to compare their results with other already reported, especially with reference 2. Adzu and Zalawu reported a very similar work about Diospyros mespiliformis extracts with antimalarial potency. What are the differences with this work? Why the Authors consider doing another work in the same plant for the same biological activity? The extraction methods of the active metabolites are much better?** **I consider that this kind of works needs to go to the next level and make some identification in the main compounds for this activity.**	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Check the manuscript for typographical errors, for example: Page 2 it said: *P.falciparum*, it should say: *P. falciparum* Page 3, it said: Therapy (10mg/kg Positive control), Infected and treated with low, medium and high dose (100, 200 and 400mg/kg leaf extract) and (50, 100, and 200mg/kg stem bark extract); it should say: Therapy (10 mg/kg Positive control), Infected and treated with low, medium and high dose (100, 200 and 400 mg/kg leaf extract) and (50, 100, and 200 mg/kg stem bark extract) Page 3: 500g, 500 g; 40° C, 40 °C … and so on.	The corrections have been effected.
Optional/General comments		