



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_34530
Title of the Manuscript:	Invivo-study of antiviral effect of Gossypium hirsutum extract on Newcastle Disease Virus.
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
There are no significant changes in the new manuscript. The authors do not explain in the introduction why they choose the <i>G. hirsutum</i> for this study, which makes the novelty of the manuscript inconsistent. Materials and methods are as confusing as in the first manuscript. Too many subtitles. The authors affirm in page 4, lines: 82-84 "<u>All test birds were treated either pre-infection, at time of infection, or at the beginning of clinical signs, post-infection with either the 0.1%, 1.0% or 10% concentration of the plant aqueous extract</u>". Taking into account this sentence, I assume there are 9 experimental groups at least (without considering the negative control or controls). Such things cannot be left to the reader's imagination. It has to be thoroughly explained in this topic. In my opinion, the Materials and Methods could have 4 subtitles: • Plant extract. • Newcastle virus propagation and quantification. • Immunization scheme with Newcastle virus. • Treatment of birds with the plant extract (exhaustively explanation of the experimental groups). Results are very inconsistent. In page 7, line 142, authors wrote that mortality was extended till day 6 in the treated group, but in page 8, line 174 they affirm that the indirectly infected birds died at days 8 and 9 p. i. Which are the indirectly infected birds? As the experimental groups are not well explained, it is confusing to elucidate when the birds really died in each experimental group. The results of table 2 are not described. In page 7, lines 151-153, the results refer the figures 1 and 2. In page 8, lines 161-162, different results refer the same figures. In page 8, lines 170-172, authors affirm that rectal temperature is lower in the treated groups than in the untreated groups, but I do not think that these values of temperatures are statistically different. So this result is totally irrelevant. Discussion is extremely weak. The interpretation	Gossypium has been introduced and the reason why we choose this plant explained in the revised manuscript. Materials and Methods have been subtitled according to your advice as; Plant extract, Newcastle virus propagation and quantification. Immunization scheme with Newcastle virus. Treatment of birds with the plant extract. Mortality was at day 2, 4, 6,8 and 9 pi, should be in line 142. This had been rectified. corrections are highlighted in yellow Well explained in the revised manuscript. The virus haemagglutinating antigen was low in the lungs (16), treachae (28) and brain (18) at preinfection, at infection and no treatment. However,high virus haemagglutination antigen occurred in the duodenum (512), proventriculus (1024),duodenum (1024) and kidney (1024) at preinfection, at infection, at disease onset and no treatment. The variation in temperature recorded in treated and untreated group was not significance there were no noticeable action of the extract against ND virus in this study. Antiviral activity was not exhibited by aqueous



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

of the results is inconsistent and not categorical. In page 11, lines 209-210 authors sustain <u>"The mechanism of action of the aqueous extract against ND virus in this study is not clear"</u> and in page 13, lines 261-262 there is another statement <u>"The degree of antiviral activity exhibited by aqueous extract of <i>Gossypium hirsutum</i> was very low"</u>. Regarding the results presented in this manuscript, the aqueous extract of <i>G. hirsutum</i> was unable to counteract the Newcastle virus. Consequently, there is no mechanism of action against the Newcastle virus. Therefore, the two ideas expressed above are totally inconsistent. In page 11, lines 212-213 authors wrote <u>"All the three antiviral regimen applied in the study resulted in virus inhibition by <i>Gossypium hirsutum</i> extract at levels between 20.3 and 80.3percent"</u>. Where did the data come from? There is no evidence of viral inhibition in the study. In page 12, lines 234-236 authors stated <u>"Although these extracts did not protect the birds from mortality due to NDV, they showed some minor effects on the progression of the disease"</u>. Another inconsistent idea. The results do not support any effect of the plant extract against the virus. The little changes observed in the treated groups compared with the control among all the study are not significant. If they are significantly different, the authors do not demonstrate it. As I mentioned in the previous revision, the whole idea is that the plant extract did not worked at preventing the infection with Newcastle virus and this is not what the authors expressed in the manuscript. On the other hand, the problems with the language were not solved. There are several typographic and grammatical errors.	extract of <i>G. Hirsutum</i>. All three antiviral regimen applied in the study did not exhibit virus inhibition by <i>G. hirsutum</i>. at levels between 20.3 and 80.3 percent has been corrected These extracts did not protect the birds from mortality due to NDV and this is suggestive of no positive effect by the <i>G. Hirsutum</i>. Noted and has been expressed in the revised manuscript. Rectified in the revised manuscript
--	---