



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_22866
Title of the Manuscript:	CYSTEINE PROTEASE INHIBITORS FROM CALOTROPIS PROCERA WITH ANTIPLASMODIAL POTENTIAL IN MICE
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	1. The English should be improved. 2. Please, it is necessary to describe the statistical tests used, the normality and variance of samples. 3) In all figures- In legend: the number of experiments that were done and statistical test employed should be added. Normality and variance of samples should be added. Differences among groups should be better explained. 4) Table 1: As DL50 was calculated should be explained. The small number of animals used in these experiments should be justified. Figure 3: It seems there are differences in animal weights before treatment. Statistical analyses should be shown. It should be explained also in discussion. Table 2: The statistical tests used should be explained. The groups that showed statistical difference should be better described. Figure 6. Add statistical test. There were statistical differences in survival rates among groups? As shown in Figure 5 and Table 3, treatment by the crude CPI from <i>Caltropis procera</i> latex only delayed the increment of parasitemia, and the inhibition of parasitemia was only 50% that of artesunate (control). These data should be better discussed. The authors should tone down the conclusions. It can be suggest the evaluation of the CPI associated to the artesunate.	1. I will try to improved the English 2. Data obtained were analyzed using One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Variant means were separated using Duncans Multiple range Pos hoc Test. Results were presented as Mean $\pm$ Standard diviation 3. Ok sir. 4. LD50 value was determined by calculating the geometric mean of the animal survived. $LD50 = \sqrt{(\text{Highest non lethal dose}) \times (\text{Lowest lethal dose})}$ This differences were shown by the variation Anova and post hoc Ducan multiple range test A survaival curve has already been shown in figure 6. This is not clear to me and the reviewers should know that artesunate has different mechanism of action from the CPI
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		