



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_8631
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>EFFECTS OF GAMMA IRRADIATION ON SEEDS GERMINATION, PLANTLETS GROWTH AND ANTIMALARIAL ACTIVITIES OF PHYLLANTHUS ODONTADENIUS Müll Arg.</i>
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	This is an interesting article. The authors irradiated <i>P. odontadenius</i> with gamma radiation to investigate the changes in morphology and composition (e.g. secondary metabolites), and antimalarial activities. The experiments carried out were in good quality. The results obtained mostly support the claims declared by authors. However the manuscript seems not well organized. Some points have to be clarified before publishing. Ok! 1. The figure legend of Fig 3a and 3b may have to be exchanged. The description of fig 3 (page 10) started with <i>P.</i> strain first, followed by <i>P. falciparum</i> k1 strain. The authors should revise the paragraph on this part. Ok! 2. Also, there is no fig. 1 in the manuscript. Yes. Page 10, line 356 indicates fig.1. The authors should revise the numbering of figures and the figure number in the article. Ok! 3. The description from 347-358 (page 10) is confusing. Please revise. Ok! 4. Paragraph in page 16, line 22-25 is repeatedly described in page 18, line 32-38. Please revise. Ok! 5. Page 19, line 19, "The best antimalarial activity was the one with the aqueous extracts	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	from stems of Kisantu's <i>P. niruri</i> with IC50 value of 11 ± 2 µg/ml, whereas we obtained IC50 <11 except for doses of 25, 50, 75, 100 and 125 Gy in M2." Ok! For <i>P. falciparum</i> chloroquine-resistente K1 strain, 13.41-12.77-14.11-11.89-12.06 were >11 µg/ml . According to fig.3, the IC50 values of 25, 50, 75, 100 and 125 Gy in M2 were all smaller than 11 . Ok! For values from clinical isolates of <i>P. falciparum</i>. What is the purpose of authors using "except for?" 6. For the antimalarial activity, the author indicated that increased level of phenolics could enhance the antimalarial activity (page 19, line 20). M2 possesses more phenolics than M1 did, however, M1 showed higher level of antimalarial activity. Why? Because the sapogenins (M1) have also effects on several diseases. M2 possesses more Flavonoids and more Terpenoids/steroids than M1 which playing a major role in <i>in vitro</i> antiplasmodial activities.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		