



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_45001
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical Screening and Antiplasmodial Activity of Ethanolic Bark Extract of Khaya grandifoliola in Swiss Albino Mice Infected with Plasmodium berghei NK65.
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 is quite interesting and scientifically robust. Authors should address the following comments: Abstract Line 14-15. The aim should capture manuscript title. Line 16. It is twenty four (24) and not 24. Line 18. Write P. berghei in full first. Line 23. The phytochemical screening protocol should come first before the others. The abstract should follow the standard formatting (i.e Introduction, Methods, Results and Conclusion). Keywords: Add Antiplasmodial Activity rather than just Antiplasmodium. Introduction Line 34. Delete WHO there, since the citation is already in the parenthesis no need of writing that and that applies to others except you are quoting an author. Always start a scientific name with a Capital letter, while the species take a small letter (Check Line 35 and 38). Introduction is segmented. Please add them up. The authors did not capture the main points concerning the title. I suggest the introduction should be rewritten. (No study on P. berghei, No discussion on Khaya grandifoliola). All citations should be cited in Number. See Line 48 and 51. Check for typographical and grammatical errors. Methods Line 69. Bankole [3] method was..... Delete Phytochemical screening of the bark from heading. Use only Extraction of the Plant Bark. Line 77-78. Reframe the statement. Line 82. Expunge the Author name. Use only [4]. Check for typographical and grammatical errors especially in citations and preparations. Line 128. Analysis spelling wrong. Results Table 1. Expunge "Result of". The Keys of the graphs are not tallying with the results. Check and present better. Scanty discussion. It should always be presented sequentially as results are presented. Please rewrite. Conclusion should highlight key findings. Few statement of recommendation is accepted. References are very scanty for such laborious study. Add more references and follow Journal guideline.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>



PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Oti Baba Victor</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University Keffi, Nigeria</i>