



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_BMRJ_16220
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTI-MEASLES VIRUS ACTIVITY OF SELECTED MEDICINAL PLANTS OF NIGERIA
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:

(<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	1) No mention of currently used drug against measles in the introduction. Why does alternative drug needed? 2) The antiviral screening and Anti-measles virus Activity does not involve any antiviral controls. Results hence doubtful. Furthermore, the virus used is the vaccine strain of measles. So how would this study be good against the wild type strain? 3) Please mention the method reference for Maximum non-toxic dose (MNTD) of extracts. Is this method reliable? What is the gold standard for testing antiviral activity for measles? 4) When writing temperature, please use the degree symbol (°C) not superscript O (°). Check all relevant symbols throughout the manuscript.	1) Currently, there is no drug for the treatment of measles. Vaccine is used for its control. In Nigeria and some other developing countries, the problem of accessibility, poor handling and cultural and religious bias against the use of vaccines makes the need for a drug to complement vaccination effort imperative. 2) Since there is no antiviral drug has ever been developed as therapeutic agents for measles virus infection, there is no basis for any control. Furthermore, it has been reported (ref. 12) that for a plant extract to be said to have antiviral activity, it must show activity in two subsequent dilutions of the MNTD (table 2). As regards the representativeness of the findings of this study to wild type strains of Measles virus, it is crucial to bear in mind the following; a) For biosafety reasons, experimenting with wild/street strains of measles virus is discouraged except in cases where it is unavoidable. Consequently, the use of vaccine strain for this kind of study is unavoidable. b) Measles virus is monotypic unlike most other RNA viruses which have multiple serotypes. This is partly as a result of the relatively large genome size and complex morphology. Consequently,



SDI Review Form 1.6

		unlike many other RNA viruses, it doesn't mutate as fast and the phenotypic/biotypic properties are quite conserved. c) The titre of the vaccine strain of the measles virus has been built up, therefore, it is expected that any agent that shows activity on it will also show activity on the wild type strain. 3) Ogbole <i>et al.</i> (2013)(Ref.8). Yes, the method is reliable and is the gold standard for testing antiviral activity for measles. 4) This has been taken care of in the manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) Abstract anti-measle drug as an alternative to vaccination. (?) This statement should be reconsidered. Drug and vaccine works differently cannot be an alternative to one another. Alternative measures in disease control can be considered. or alternative drug to the current available drugs is much better.	1) The authors agree with the reviewer and the corrections have been implemented in the manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		