



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_31322
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of substituents nature on the antiplasmodial and cytotoxic activities of 5-chloro-3,4-dihydro-1H-pyrano[3,4-b]-1,10-phenanthrolinone as antimalarial agent
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1. The initial comment, " Line 7-11- The content does not qualify for a purpose for the study. The purpose should be re-written " has not been addressed. Besides, the causative species of Plasmodium are now five and not four (with the inclusion of <i>Plasmodium knowlesi</i>).	This part was rewritten
2. The previous comment, " Line 19-20 – The conclusion should also be re-written and should be in agreement with the purpose " has also not been addressed.	The conclusion was rewritten
3. Line 37-39 – The comment made previously has not been properly addressed. The addition of "our" does not eliminate the ambiguity in the statement. The statement requires proper grammatical construction for the purpose of public reading.	The sentences were rewritten
4. Line 46-48 – " <u>Access to product 2 has been valued by a pharmacomodulation which consists to substitute the chlorine of the pyridine ring by various substituents having amino groups</u> ". The issue with grammatical construction still persist, especially, <u>which consists to substitute</u> . Kindly revisit and reconstruct the phrase.	The sentences were rewritten
5. Line 48-50 – " Indeed, it has been shown that the introduction of amino groups having units of type morpholine, alkyldiamine, piperazine, etc., brings better antiplasmodial activities to other family of molecules. " The full stop has been effected but the citation is still missing. Since the initial part of the sentence indicate that, " it has been shown.... ", it is imperative to cite the literature which report this observation.	The references were given
6. Line 100 – replace " <u>by using</u> " with "with".	Replacement was done
7. Line 100-102 – " The aqueous layer was extracted with dichloromethane (3x50 ml), then the organic layer dried over Na₂SO₄, filtered and evaporated ". The understanding is that, the crude extract after mixing with water, was extracted with dichloromethane to "pick up" the non-polar compounds, which invariably forms the organic phase, but the construction put forward in the manuscript does not communicate so. The impression from the current grammatical construction in the current manuscript means the an aqueous solution has been extracted with dichloromethane, which is scientifically impossible, bearing in mind, <i>like dissolves like</i> ; hence my previous question, " how can the aqueous layer be extracted with dichloromethane? ". Thus, authors are kindly requested to reconstruct the sentence to bring out the meaning intended.	The sentences were rewritten
8. Line 102-103 – The authors response " Some of them were precipitated in cold ether, and others were purified by flash chromatography. The precision is given in the supplement info part " is not reflected in the manuscript. The ambiguity still exist in the sentence. Authors should kindly reconstruct the sentence to bring out the	The sentences were rewritten



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

meaning given to the reviewer’s comment. 9. Line 206 – “H-donnor” should read H-donor. 10. Line 214-215 – “Indeed, most the IC₅₀ is greater, lower the compound is potentially toxic.” The sentence is grammatically wrong. Firstly, “most the IC₅₀ is greater” should preferably read “<i>most of the IC₅₀ are greater</i>”. Also, if the phrase is linked to the second part of the sentence, then the appropriate conjunction should be used. “lower the compound is potentially toxic” is a difficult phrase to comprehend grammatically. 11. Line 216-217 – “However, the selectivity index of this compound is low to allow passing from the <i>in vivo</i> to the <i>in vivo</i> test.” The attempted rewritten sentence still contains some level of ambiguity. If the selectivity index for the compound 8 from <i>in-vitro</i> test is too low to warrant translating significance into in-vivo tests, then the sentence should be reconstructed in that understanding. “To allow passing” is too colloquial an English for a scientific publication. 12. Line 217-218 – “Because according to Long-Ze, the selectivity index must be greater than or equal to 100 the <i>in vivo</i> test is permitted”. The word, “because” is inappropriate to start a sentence. 13. References on line 232-233 and line 252 are not properly cited. Citing a book as a reference requires certain information to appear in the citation. Authors are referred to the referencing requirement in the template for the journal. Reference to a book: <u>Personal author(s)</u> Rang HP, Dale MM, Ritter JM, Moore PK. Pharmacology. 5th ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone; 2003. <u>Editor(s) or compiler(s) as authors</u> Beers MH, Porter RS, Jones TV, Kaplan JL, Berkwits M, editors. The Merck manual of diagnosis and therapy. 18th ed. Whitehouse Station (NJ): Merck Research Laboratories; 2006. <u>Authored chapter in edited publication</u> Glennon RA, Dukat M. Serotonin receptors and drugs affecting serotonergic neurotransmission. In: Williams DA, Lemke TL, editors. Foye's principles of medicinal chemistry. 5th ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2002.	Correction was made The sentence was rewritten The sentence was rewritten The word because is deleted The references were corrected
---	---