



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 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	Abstract; (Is a summary of a research report) Purpose; change ti to 'to' Methodology: 1. The weight range and number of the mice are not stated. 2. Why random distribution of both sexes. Did you consider the possibility of them mating? This will definitely affect the result/s. 3. The topic is on 'methanol extract'. Why the other three fractions? 4. What is the LD₅₀ for both the leaf and the stem bark? What is the rationale for using the dosage you are using? Result: 1. The result is reporting the phytochemical screening, PCV, haemoglobin and weight changes of organs. This is not the aim of the study. The antiplasmodial activity of the plant is not stated in the result. Conclusion: There is nothing to ascertain authoritatively that the plant as antiplasmodial potential. Words like <may have> should be used when making conclusion with scientific backing. What is the mechanism of action?	Corrections were effected in the following: 1. Abstract 2. Methodology 3. Result 4. Materials and methods 5. Discussion 6. Conclusion 7. Key words The mechanisms of action exhibited were competitive and non-competitive pattern of inhibition for leaf and stem bark extracts respectively. All corrections are in yellow colour.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Key words: mice is not a key. Key words are essential terms of a research work. Introduction Line 5. Change < is due> to< has been reported to be due to high>....then give a reference. Line 10...There should be statement explaining the need for the statement in line 10-12. Line 18... after< reported>, there should be a reference before the e.g Line 20...There should be a documentation of the usage of the plant by a certain ethnic group locally for its property before the statement of need for the research is made. Material and methods 2.1.1plant material: line2...authenticated by who? 2.1.2 Experimental animal: Line 3....Change <cage to cages> Rephrase< allowed to acclimatize> to allow to acclimatized and <Condition to conditions> Line 4-10.... Refer to comments in abstract <methodology> 2 and 3. 2.2.1 preparation and fractionation of plant extract: Lines 2 ...remove< to powder form>. It is the same thing as pulverised. Line 3.... Remove < a portion> Line 4....why 48 hours? Line 5.. Why filter paper? Filter paper will permit the residue into the filtrate.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 6- 14. Expunge. Not necessary as per the topic. 2.2.2 Parasite: Line 3.... Write the ref :e.g method by Efi and Efi ,then use number superscript 2.2.4 Antiplasmodial Activity (4-Days Suppressive Test): line 3 <i>Plasmodium berghei berghei</i> not <i>Plasmodium berghei</i> Line 4 <then> should be removed. From 130 mice i.e line 4 to 6 should be moved to line 2 of 2.2.4. Haematological assay should come up before Estimation of parasitemia 3.0 RESULTS TABLE 1: QUALITATIVE PHYTOCHEMICAL ANALYSIS (mg/kg) OF< methanol extract> Tables 2 and 3 are not needed as per the topic of the research. You are working on the methanol extract. OR THE TOPIC SHOULD BE CHANGED TO INCLUDE THE THREE FRACTIONS THUS <Antimalarial Potentials of Leaf and Stem Bark EXTRACTS of <i>Diospyros mespiliformis</i> on <i>Plasmodium berghei</i> <berghei> Infected Mice> <METHANOL SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM THE TABLE TITLES IF THE TOPIC IS CHANGED>	The Title of the Manuscript has been changed to ‘In-vivo antiplasmodial activity of Aqueous, N-butanol and Ethylacetate fractions of Leaf and Stem Bark Methanol Extracts of <i>Diospyros mespiliformis</i> on <i>Plasmodium berghei</i> berghei (Nk65) Infected Mice². All corrections has been effected
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	4. DISCUSSION The discussion in totality needs to be redone. What are the functions of the phytochemicals. How do you relate it to your findings? *MOST IMPORTANTANTLY* research findings are discussed by relating them to other peoples findings. Example, does it agree or not agree with research similar to the present study. Suggestive biochemical reasons should be given to your findings as backup. 5. CONCLUSION What scientific validation have you been able to prove? What is the mechanism of action of this plant? There is no scientific basis for the conclusion given in this study.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The work lacks scientific explanation.	