SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JOCAMR_38126**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EFFECT OF ETHYL ACETATIC EXTRACT OF Cymbopogon citratus LEAF ON Trypanosoma brucei INFECTION IN ALBINO RATS**
Type of the 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**s (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 author should mention the exact species used in this manuscript; *T.b. brucei, T.b. rhodosiense or T.b gambiense*. • Line 7 "mg/kg body weight of the plant extracts" needs correction to "mg/Kg (plant extract per body weight)". Same on line 9 and 11. • Then from line 13 to 15 the "infected" appears unnecessary and delete the word. Also, on lines 265 and 270. • Line 21, "Nagan" is incorrect and correct word is *"Nagana"* and in italics. • Line 21-23, the sentence needs restructuring it appears to be in a repetitive form. Another repetitive form is between lines 37-39. • Lines 27-34, 39-40, appears not necessary and out of topic as the topic is an antitrypansomal study not a genome or phylum studies. • Line 56 -57, "destroying or inhibiting" microbiological used terms are "cidal and static". • Lines 57-63 and lines 70- 72 appear as repetitive and should be condensed. • Under Plant Material include Plant Identification Number or Voucher No. • Lines 92-93, "kept in a desicators for its phytochemical screening and trypanocidal screening" should be changed to "kept in desiccators till the phytochemical screening and trypanocidal screening." • Under "Inoculation of Rats", line 95, instead of "Infected" use Passaged or Inoculated. And instead of "highly infected blood" used High Parasitaemia blood. Lines 96-98, process of inoculation details are not necessary. • Under "Invivo test for trypanocidal activity", it appears there are two negative control [False (Uninfected and Untreated) and True (Infected and Untreated)] so where is the positive control [Infect and treated (with a standard drug)]? When did treatment start which day exactly? • The section of "experimental animals" should come before "inoculation of rats" and reduce it as it is very long. Also, add the Ethical Approval Number as required in author guidelines. • Section "Phytochemical Evaluation" it is very long [about 3 pages]. Remove it and just insert a general reference, either article or book. • The Titles for Figures 1 and 2, Table 2 are too long [2 lines] reduce to one [1] line. • In Figure one, group one is excluded, why? • The references in the manuscript are shorter [22] than listed [25]. The references in the manuscript are only 22, than listed 25	
Minor REVISION comments	• There are some formatting errors like in text "Ethyl acetate" appears as "Ethylacetate" in several places like line 5, 8, 16, 87, 101, 133, 193, 202, 244, 281 and 284. • Lines 47-53, not necessary as the study was conducted in Nigeria [From Plant Material], not in India. Give the Local vernacular names from Nigeria. • Line 129, "Principle" are we in a class? Just give referenced procedure • Line 229, "Figure 3", where? • Line 242, "extractmay" insert a space. • Over spacing is general problem. • Certain words start on pervious line and continue in the next: line 22-23, 23-24 • Line 249, "pervious experiment" where is the reference? • Line 250, "Pilot study", again reference?	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	• Line 279, “that died because of not being treated” not needed, delete it	
Optional/General comments	• The manuscript content appears to be sound. • It is an interesting topic. • The plant used appears to have future application potentials in other diseases and treatment potentials.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Muhammad Muhsin Fathuddin***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Microbiology, Kaduna State University, Nigeria***