

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_87226
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIPLASMODIAL ACTIVITIES OF CRUDE EXTRACTS AND COMPOUNDS DERIVED FROM SELECTED INDIGENOUS MEDICINAL PLANTS USED TRADITIONALLY TO TREAT MALARIA IN KENYA
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:

(<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>After through observation, it was found that the methodologies and data presentation within the manuscript were excellent. All the authors has given their satisfactory affords for the work. Well explained the procedures. However, few minors' points to be rectify before further proceeding. These are highlighted below in the point wise manners.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Over all grammatical and spelling correction is needed.</li><li>2. Rewrite the introduction section in one-two paragraph only. Avoid multiple paragraphs.</li><li>3. Include the full forms for all the abbreviation within the text after conclusion section.</li><li>4. Mention the exact date and time for the collection of all the plants species under in the methodology section.</li><li>5. Under Methodology section: Include plant authentication number for all the plants.</li><li>6. Give a separate heading for Statistic data after the result and discusion section.</li><li>7. After LC<sub>50</sub> and LD<sub>50</sub>, BCL, CCL and MPL were chosen for the isolation of the pure compounds, Why? <i>V. glabra</i> was excluded however authors has clearly mentioned in the page No.10 under result and discussion section-DCM of <i>V. glabra</i> leaves was found to be more active with an LC<sub>50</sub> OF 2.499 µg/ml its MLC was the most active against brime shrimp with LD<sub>50</sub> OF 0.106 µg/ml? Justify it.</li></ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sonam Bhutia
Department, University & Country	Government Pharmacy College, India