

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_120985
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro anti-Plasmodium activities of Delonix regai and Carica paya extracts in combination with chloroquine
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript with the title: " <i>In vitro</i> anti- <i>Plasmodium</i> activities of <i>Delonix regai</i> and <i>Carica paya</i> extracts in combination with chloroquine" is a very good one, which could help address the treatment of malaria, not just with the tested drug but with other antimalarial drugs. Medicinal plants have always been a safe haven for the synthetic medicines, and so, with studies like this, further research can be spun out of this and make the problem of high mortality caused by malaria to be a thing of the past. Therefore, the value of this research cannot be over emphasized.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is too detailed in the methodology section. The method used should be kept simple and details can come inside the manuscript under the methodology section.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The discussion is not scientifically robust, and thus, I have suggested it be expanded. Also, there can be some addition of experiments such as <i>in silico</i> studies which will tell what compounds may be responsible for these activities and that could help increase the depth and robustness of the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There are a handful references that are too old. They can be changed and new ones can be supplemented.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English Language can be improved upon, it is not so good, as well as the scientific writing of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Introduction section: the sentence below is confusing and not correctly outlayed. It should be rewritten. "approximately 50% of all cases were in Nigeria (27%), the Democratic Republic of the Congo (12%), Uganda (5%), and Mozambique (4%)."2) It is not safe to make sentences like this one below. There are definitely some years where the figures are either higher or lower. Therefore, the sentence below should be rephrased. "Kenya experiences 10,700 fatal cases and 3.3 million new clinical cases of malaria each year, despite multiple well-coordinated control initiatives."3) Using the word "Chemotherapy" in the treatment of malaria, I don't think is appropriate. Chemotherapy is usually used for cancer treatment. You may want to change that. (Page 2).4) Consistency is key when writing. Using words like "antimalarial" and "antimalarial"; "milliliters and ml" shows inconsistency and should be changed all over the manuscript.5) The phytochemical analysis methods under the methodology section, it was not stated what references these methods were obtained. It is very important to cite articles where methods are gotten from, for reference purposes. Kindly adjust that.6) Sections 3.3.4 and 3.3.7 should be re-written to help for more clarity for the readers. Punctuations are used inappropriately, making the sentences not so clear. Also, section 3.3.7 should be written as a second person report (past tense) and not in present tense (first person).7) Section 3.3.5: the formula should be inserted in form of a formula and not just written as a text, for scientific purposes.8) Section 3.3.6: alignment to the left is not consistent with other sections. Please change that. Also in this section, the word "Finally" was used in the third sentence, and next you have words like "After that" being used in the fourth sentence. This should be changed.9) Results: Yes, it is easy to understand how you got the IC_{50} of the individual treatment. However, it is very unclear how you can combine the plant extracts and the drug, and then obtain individual IC_{50}. What I expected to see was the IC_{50} obtained from the combination based on their various combinations, and then a calculation to show synergism or not. How you got to separate the IC_{50} from each other when the compounds where mixed, and you were able to detect that of plant extract differentially from that of the drug, must be a new technique and I don't think it is common. You need to explain this so as not to confuse the readers, because I am confused and would like to be educated.10) Discussion: From the discussion section, there is no much depth. Comparison of the results obtained with what is out there in the literature, the significance of the result relative to what has been obtained out there in the literature, the relevance of this result in further studies which may be undertaken to further this studies, were all missing. Hence, the discussion section should be expanded for	

Review Form 3

	robustness and futuristic realities.	
--	--------------------------------------	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joshua C. Nwabuife
Department, University & Country	University of the Free State, South Africa