



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- Heading: As I understood, 10 part of 7 plants, and it must be indicated. Readers may think 10 different plants. I may suggest heading as “Anti-viral activity evaluation of various parts of selected 7 medicinal plants of Nigeria against Measles virus: <i>Xylopia aethiopica</i> and <i>Uvaria chamae</i> have anti-measles activity” 2- Abstract, line 6: Authors mentioned about 10 plants, I suggest it will be usefull to indicate their names in the abstract. 3- Abstract, line 21: <i>X. aethiopica</i> and <i>U. chamae</i> must be as key words. 4- In the introduction section, lines 25-26; reference was not properly indicated in the reference section, the	1) The authors appreciate the reviewers' suggestion as regards the title of this study. Consequently, the title has been changed to “Antiviral activity evaluation of selected medicinal plants in Nigeria against Measles virus”. However, the names of the active plants and number of different plants screened in the study have been captured in the abstract. Furthermore the keywords have been carefully selected to ensure that any search for the active plants will lead to the discovery of this study. 2) The correction has been effected as advised. 3) Corrected 4) This has been corrected as advised.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	first paragraph was taken from the datas of WHO, but the second sentence is not actual and the true sentence from the WHO site is “Approximately 145 700 people died from measles in 2013 – mostly children under the age of 5.” and authors must change the reference “ 1” with http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs286/en/ Their reference refers to only copyright of WHO. 5- In Material and Methods section lines 62-64; I think 10 plant parts from 7 plants. This must be explained as 10 plant parts from 7 plants in the first paragraph of this section.. 6- In Material and Methods section: There must be at least 1 reference related the methods used by authors. 7- In discussion part line 247: ”a dearth of report” may change as “lack of” or “a few report” is more scientific use of English.	5) It has been inserted in the first paragraph. 6) Reference eight (8) has been cited for the antiviral assay while reference nine (9) has been cited for cytotoxicity assay. 7) This has been corrected to “lack of” as advised.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	8- Conclusion part line 251;“ Three fractions showed significant ” three fractions must be written by name.	8) The three (3) fractions have been mentioned as suggested.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	1- In discussion part, new references may be added like anti-cancer effect of <i>Xylopi aethiopica</i> http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24708588 and antibacterial effects of <i>Xylopi aethiopica</i> http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20161962. The readers may need to know related therapies with this plant. These knowledges may also be given in Introduction section. 2- Also there is a valuable study related with the introocular pressure effect of <i>Xylopi aethiopica</i> by Uzodike et al., to cite this article may be helpfull http://www.ajol.info/index.php/jnoa/article/download/56629/45053 3- For <i>Uvaria chamae</i> physichal and chemical properties, this reference may be used. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11031775	1) The references have been taken into consideration and appropriately cited in discussion. 2) The references have been taken into consideration and appropriately cited in discussion. 3) The references have been taken into consideration and appropriately cited in discussion.