



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article:	Original research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
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 berghei</i> (Nk65) Infected Mice. Line 5-6: Lower case letters for red highlights. Line 8: Duration means length of time for the research not period of research Line 9-12: The researcher has no idea of the concept, LD50 – the lethal dose that will kill 50% of the population not the dosage as stated. Line 20: First use of the abbreviation 'PCV' should be in full. Line 20: haemoglobin not Haemoglobin Line 20: Significant should be followed by the level used e.g. significant (P<0.05) Line 21: Same as line 20 Line 22: Same as line 20 Line 23: How did you establish the antiplasmodial activity concluded? Nothing is mentioned about the suppressive effect of the extract in the result. How did you established the conclusion given. Line 24-25: What do you mean by 'competitive and non-competitive pattern of inhibiton'? How? And on what? Line 26: 'Antiplasmodial activity' not just 'antiplasmodial' as akey word. Line 35: Changed 'destroy' to 'destroyed' Line 53: Needs reference after 'haemostatic' Line 55: Give a reference to the study. Line 58-59: Why go through the trouble of reanalysing the bioactive component? Line 67: Who is Gallah U. J. A taxonomist or what? Line 75: 130 mice? 13 groups with 5 mice each gives 65 mice in total. Explain please! Line 101-102: The year should be deleted. Line 110: Year should be deleted Line 113: b.wt (body weight) should be written in full Line 130: Year should be deleted. Line 190-191: What is the scientific basis for this strong conclusion? How did it work? Line 198-204: You are only stating the result. There is no scientific discussion of haemoglobin, packed cell volume and organ weights. Line 206-217: A conclusion is usually a brief statement of what the result portrays not a discussion. Line 209-212: Should have been in the introduction, describing the published potentials of the plant. Line 215: Explain the manner of the competitive and non-competitive patterns of inhibition and on what parameters.	- All corrections were effected -Competitive inhibition:This usually results from the inhibitor having an affinity for the active site of an enzyme where the substrate also binds; the substrate and inhibitor <i>compete</i> for access to the enzyme's active site. -Non-competitive inhibition: It occurs where the binding of the inhibitor to the enzyme reduces its activity but does not affect the binding of substrate. -The mechanism of inhibition against Cyseine protease extracts from <i>Plasmodium berghei</i> was determined at different substrate concentrations and at a fixed concentration of inhibitor. Using Lineweaver–Burk plots, in the presence and absence of an inhibitor, Km and Vmax. were calculated from the plot. Secondary plot was used to estimate inhibition constant(Ki). -All corrections were effected A taxonomist Leaf extract=65mice, stem bark=65mice Competitive inhibition:This usually results from the inhibitor having an affinity for the active site of an enzyme where the substrate also binds; the substrate and inhibitor <i>compete</i> for access to the enzyme's



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

	active site. -Non-competitive inhibition: It occurs where the binding of the inhibitor to the enzyme reduces its activity but does not affect the binding of substrate. -The mechanism of inhibition against Cyseine protease extracts from <i>Plasmodium berghei</i> was determined at different substrate concentrations and at a fixed concentration of inhibitor. Using Lineweaver–Burk plots, in the presence and absence of an inhibitor, K_m and V_{max} were calculated from the plot. Secondary plot was used to estimate inhibition constant(K_i).
--	---