



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> 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 are 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 the significance of this study.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<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.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dr Ian Cock
Department, University & Country	Biomolecular and Physical Sciences Griffith University Australia