



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_39603
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro Antiplasmodial and Toxicity Activities of Crude Extracts and Compounds from Euclea latideus (Ebenaceae)
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	The manuscript presents antiplasmodial activities and toxicity of some extracts and pure compounds isolated from <i>E. latideus</i>. The work seems to be interesting. - To improve the quality of the manuscript, I suggest some English language editing service. - To compare IC₅₀ values of pure compounds the concentrations should be given in mol/L. - The definition and interpretation of RI are not clear in the text. - You have good results, but the discussion is not clear. - The English must be improved. - The IC₅₀ values of pure compounds should to be given in mol/L. - In the Introduction I suggest discuss more about the traditional use of the <i>E. latideus</i> to treat malaria. - In the Methodology you said that you used hexane, dichloromethane, EtOAc and MeOH to carry out the extract of crude sample, but in the Material and Methods you report only dichloromethane and EtOAc extract. Clarify the divergence of information. - Explain more about the calculation of RI, and how to interpret the value. - Improve the discussion about results of biological assays. - Page 6, line 168: replace the term “spectrophotometric” to “spectroscopy”. - Improve the conclusion, and explain why <i>E. latideus</i> can be offer prophylactic cure. Page 13, Figure 2: the structure of betulin is incorrect. Also all the structures aren't good, I suggest check the bond angles.	- Work was edited and necessary corrections made - Concentration of pure compounds expressed in μM - More information on malaria added for the plant - Hexane and methanol were considered to have fats and sugars respectively, therefore not considered for purification - Explanation on the calculation of RI clarified - Discussion about bioassays improved upon - Term spectrophotometric replaced with spectroscopy - Structure for betulin corrected –CH₂OH inserted and all structures worked on - Conclusion restructured
Minor REVISION comments	Replace the term “remedies” to “medicines” in the throughout the text. Replace the term “DD2” to “Dd2”. Page 1, line 40: you cited that local communities popularly use <i>E. latideus</i> to treat malaria. Where are these local communities? Page 3, lines 61-63: What medicinal plants you are talking about, <i>Cinchona calysia</i>	- Term remedies replaced with medicines - Correction for DD2 made - Study conducted in Butebo Sub-County, Pallisa District, Eastern Uganda - Was referring to <i>E. latideus</i>, correction made



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and <i>Artemisia annua</i>? Page 5, lines 120-126: the second paragraph in Material and Methods is very confused, I suggest reformulate. Page 5, line 123: replace the term “washed” to eluted. Page 12, lines 282-284: replace the terms “C-23, C-24, C-25, C-26, C-27, C-28 and C-30” to “H-23, H-24, H-25, H-26, H-27, H-28 and H-30”. Page 12, lines 291-292: replace the terms “C-23, C-24, C-25, C-26, C-27, and C-30” to “H-23, H-24, H-25, H-26, H-27 and H-30”. Page 12, lines 300-301: replace the terms “C-23, C-24, C-25, C-26, C-27, C-28 and C-29” to “H-23, H-24, H-25, H-26, H-27, H-28 and H-29”. Page 13, line 318: replace the term “germinal” to “geminal”. Page 14, line 333: Dept spectrum doesn’t show quaternary carbon. Page 14, line 333: replace the term “determined” to “assigned”. Page 17, lines 386 and 392: What the meaning of 23ethane proton and 24ethane proton? Page 23, line 488: replace the term “positive” to “standard”. Page 7, lines 173 and 174: I suggest putting the sentence “This study gives the first report of isolation...” before Figure 1. Page 7, lines 189-191: I suggest reformulate. Page 7, line 193: replace the term “positive control” to “standard control”. Page 8, line 207: replace the term “IC₅₀’s” to “IC₅₀”. Why didn’t you do the toxicity assays with pure compounds? Page 10, line 269: I suggest replace the name of the subtitle. Table 1 is confused; I suggest organize better the ideas.	• Paragraph reformulated • Term eluted inserted • All the C replaced with H • Spelling for geminal corrected • Line 333, 488 corrections made • Lines 173 and 174 taken to above figure 1 • Lines 189-191 reformulated • Term positive control replaced • Correction for line 207 made • Toxicity assays on pure compounds were not done due to small quantities of the samples which enabled only spectroscopic analysis. • Line 269 subtitle renamed • Table 1, organised
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I suggest adding COSY, HSQC and HMBC spectra and highlight the correlations that you mentioned in the text.	• COSY, HSQC and HMBC spectra added