



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_3952
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIDIARRHOEAL POTENTIALITY OF LEAF EXTRACTS OF MORINGA OLEIFERA

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This paper is interesting, relevant and the assays were apparently well conducted. However the presentation needs to be considerably improved. Many passages are unclear or confusing mainly in regard to the antimicrobial activity assays and results. List of corrections/suggestions: ABSTRACT: -Line 1: Please rewrite to "(...)antidiarrhoeal activity of aqueous and methanolic extracts from <i>M. oleifera</i> leaves(...) - Line 4: Delete "and a natural source of treatment". - Line 7: Correct "was done" to "were done". - Line 8: Correct "uesd" to "used", - Methodology and Results sections in Abstract should be revised since there are many information on methodology among the results. - In several sentences the authors refer only to "the extract" but they worked with two extracts. Please specify or use "extracts". - Line 12: Correct "With" to "with" and "<i>S.typhi</i>" to "<i>S. typhi</i>". Revise along all the manuscript. - Line 14: Correct "carbohyrdates" to "carbohydrates". - Line 21: Correct to "(...)travelled by charcoal suspension (marker) divided(...)". INTRODUCTION	Abstract has been corrected as per the suggestions of the learned referee and highlighted in yellow.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- "A number of medicinal plants, traditionally used for over 1000 years named "rasayana" are present(...)". What are you referring as "rasayana"? Please rewrite. - The introduction can be divided into more paragraphs. - Please italicise all "M. oleifera" along the manuscript. - Delete "which forms the basis of its traditional use in diarrhea". MATERIAL AND METHODS - Please do not use "room temperature". Specify the values. - Again: in several sentences the authors refer only to "the extract" but they worked with two extracts. Please specify or use "extracts". - Was the aqueous extract also concentrated in rotary evaporator or lyophilized? - Correct to: "The extract obtained was filtered, concentrated in rotary flash evaporator and maintained at 45 °C. Next, the percentage (...)" . If both extracts were rotary evaporated please use the sentence in plural. -Section 2.4.1: Correct to: "The bacteria <i>Staphylococcus</i> (...) <i>cholerae</i>, which are potential causative pathogens for different diseases, were used during the present experiment and procured from Hi-Media Laboratories (Mumbai, India)." - Section 2.4.3: Correct to "The positive control wells were filled (...)." -Section 2.4.4: Rewrite and include more information. What was the extract volume added to the tubes? Also the MIC calculation and definition should be included. - Section 2.5: Include the process number in the Ethical committee.	"Rasayana" is a Sanskrit word used for medicine. The introduction has been divided into paragraphs. Everywhere <i>M. oleifera</i> has been italicised This has been deleted The temperature has been mentioned Necessary corrections made Both the extracts were concentrated in rotary flash evaporator Rest of the corrections which were suggested by the reviewer have been done The process no. has been written
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-Section 2.6. Please rewrite the sentence: “in order to feed a dose of <i>M. oleifera</i> leaf extracts at the rate 100 mg/kg body weight of rat the minimum inhibition concentration of bacteria was found out and the extract was suitably concentrated to meet the requirement in the minimum volume”. I did not understand it. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION - Rewrite the first paragraph. It is not clear when you are referring to <i>M. oleifera</i> samples or to other plants. Also, what is the real objective of this paragraph? - Lines 144-145: Delete “following the agar disc diffusion (...) by broth dilution method”. - Results from antibacterial assay are confusing. It is difficult to interpret the results without the definition of MIC. Are there distinct MIC values for agar diffusion and broth dilution methods? It is not clear. - Table 1: What is the difference between “NF*” and (-)? What means (-)? There is no MIC information for <i>S. aureus</i> in this Table. - Table titles did not mention MIC values. - Lines 178-179: To what extract are you referring in the sentence “In the present investigation (...) against all the pathogens”? - The MIC value informed in Table 1 for <i>V. cholerae</i> (4 mg/mL) does not correspond to the value in Figure 5 (0% inhibition at this concentration). Also it was stated that “for <i>V. cholerae</i> it was 32 mg/mL”. Please revise. And, if you determined MIC for agar diffusion and broth dilution method, clarify in the text. - Also, there is no MIC value for <i>S. aureus</i> in Table 1 but I believe that the Figure 3 allows to determine a MIC value. In addition the authors stated that “The MIC (...) for <i>V. cholerae</i> and <i>S. aureus</i> it was 32 mg/mL”, but this don’t	The language has been simplified Paragraph has been corrected Deleted MIC is minimum inhibitory concentration which at which 100% bacteria gets inhibited. Yes the values are distinct for the methods The paragraph has been re-written Deleted, the Zone of inhibition for <i>S. aureus</i> was not found in the given concentrations therefore broth dilution method was done so as to find out the concentration at which the bacteria gets inhibited. The tables are for agar diffusion so the title is Zone of inhibition The corrections in the results have been done
--	--	--

correspond to the results in Figure 3. - The Table 2 shows “NF” for MIC on <i>S. aureus</i> and <i>V. cholera</i> but I also believe that MIC values can be determined using the data in Figures 3 and 5. Again: are the distinct MICs being presented in the paper? - The authors stated that “the methanolic extract proved to be more effective than the aqueous extract” but the curves in Figures 1-5 are very similar for both extracts. Also no statistical analysis is reported (as well as standard deviation values) to support this statement. Line 214 (and other passages in the manuscript): Please do not refer to any of the extracts using only “<i>M. oleifera</i>”. It is more correct and clear using the term “leaf extract” and to specify if you are referring to the methanolic, aqueous or both. - Line 260. Correct to “and reduction of the volume of intestinal content”. - Line 268. I believe that the term “reduced induction time” is being wrong employed here. Please clarify what you are trying to say. Also, revise the sentence in the conclusion: “The results support the medicinal (...) that can be used as antimicrobial agents in new drugs for diarrhoea”. This paper only shows an in vitro antibacterial assay and the values were not very good. REFERENCES - Revise all references according to the instructions. There are some with journal titles abbreviated and other with full journal titles. Also it is not necessary to discriminated between 2012a and 2012b, for example, if references are numbered.	The significant values have been mentioned The given suggestion has been followed Corrected The lines have been removed The given suggestions have been followed.
--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

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