



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/IJBCRR/2438
Title of the Manuscript:	Antifungal activity of Terminalia mantaly on the in vitro growth of Cryptococcus neoformans

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 9 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	- The language is not correct in places and needs correction. I would recommend using the spelling/grammar check function of the word processor as this would detect and correct most of these errors. Or have a colleague proficient in English proof read the manuscript before submitting it. The manuscript needs extensive grammatical corrections throughout. - The introduction introduces the need for something that can inhibit C. neoformans yet there is no background on the plant that the authors chose to study – why was this plant chosen? Does it have a history of ethnobotanical usage to control this fungus? Or has it been shown to have activity against other fungi? Some background is needed to explain why this species was chosen. - No positive or negative control data has been included in table 1 or figure 1. This is needed to show the assay is working properly. - No statistical analysis appears to have been done. I assume the results presented in the table and figure is mean values not just single results? If not, these tests need replicating. If they are means, this needs stating in the legends. Also SEM should also be shown. And significant differences from the controls need showing. - A more in depth discussion is required to explain	- Thank you, it should be grateful if we accept that the manuscript has been submitted to other persons competent in the language reassess grammatical and spelling. - In traditional medicine this specie of plant to treat arterial hypertension, gastro enteritis, postpartum care as well as mycosis infections (Andriantsoa et Andriantsiferana, 1983; Rivière et al., 2005; The plants in the center of Mampuya, 2000; Orwal et al., 2009). Besides this plant has given satisfying results about other germs: candida albicans, Aspergillus fumigatus (Yayé et al., 2011 et Yayé et al., 2012). Through these encouraging results we wanted to know if the extracts of the bark of this specie had also inhibitive activities on Cryptococcus neoformans specially as the Cryptococcus became the third fungi infection after aspergillosis and candidosis. Moreover, in the world cryptococcosis is one of the main causes of morbidity and mortality of HIV/AIDS patients (Dromer et al., 2004; Levitz et Boekhout, 2006; Bovers et al., 2008; Parc et al., 2009). - In the method, we explained that there are 2 tubes. Those tubes are used as control tubes in which one was without a plant extract used to



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the significance of this study.	monitor the growth of germs, and the other germ-free tube and without plant extract was used as sterility controls to the culture medium. The control tube used to monitor the growth of germs with concentration 0µg/mL compared to the extract is elevated at 100% and this value is represented for each extract on the figure 1 by the value 100% of survival. -In the results, we mentioned that those results are the average of 6 tests of each extract. -You will find the statistics and the comment in the results.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- In the Materials and Methods section the authors state that the fungus was supplied as a clinical isolate without any detail of identification. This only needs the statement that the fungus was supplied and identified by - The authors state that the extracts were dried yet do not then state what they were redissolved in for testing. This is a very important point and needs addressing, because the solvent used should then also be tested in the assay as a control. I assume this was water but this needs stating.	-We present you our apologies; this germ has been isolated and identified: n° 3190/ PLR of the 06-04-2000. You will find in the material. PRL is the Spine Liquid Sample. -The extracts obtained are directly dissolved by homogenization in the agar. It's exempt from solvent as after the extraction, the solvent is evaporated whether in a dry or in under a vacuum. Therefore the extract can not still contain solvent. Thank you,
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		