

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_111313
Title of the Manuscript:	IN VIVO ANTIPLASMODIAL ACTIVITY COMPARISON OF PHYLLANTHUS ODONTADENIUS Müll. Arg. FROM THREE DIFFERENTS REGIONS IN DRC
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive. However, there are couple of poorly constructed sentences and unsuitable diction used. Please revisit.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The references are sufficient. But more recent studies need to be included. Most of the cited works are very old.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Generally fair. Some sentences were not properly constructed and hence difficult to comprehend. Do well to also correct punctuation errors in the work.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1) Any reason for the choice locations from where the plant used for the study was obtained?</p> <p>2) The formulae for parasite density and parasite growth suppression percent were omitted in the manuscript given. Please include.</p> <p>3) Methodology was quite detailed but was sort of hazy. Do well to present the steps in a simple, easy-to-follow manner.</p> <p>4) Simple percentage calculation grossly insufficient for result analysis for a study of this nature. A more advanced statistical tool should be adopted to draw more logical and statistically-backed comparison of the different findings with the various concentrations of the extract.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kingsley Chimuanya Umezurike
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria