



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJBcRR_16039
Title of the Manuscript:	AFRICAN NATURAL PRODUCTS WITH POTENTIAL ANTITRYPANOSOMA PROPERTIES. A REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review 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	The current research and available literature on the subject matter has gone far beyond what the authors of this article presented here. In short, this article has not updated or adds anything new especially for those familiar with the subject matter and who wish to do further research in the area. The article reviewed only 64 medicinal plants, while in reality over 250 plants have been investigated for antitrypanosomal activities in the last 2 decades alone. The article failed to identify existing gaps in reported antitrypanosomal medicinal plants research using comprehensive analysis. It also failed to identify some significant progress made such as isolation, characterization and elucidation of the mechanisms of action of antitrypanosomal compounds from African medicinal plants. The authors also failed to speculate future prospect and suggest ways forward. The presentation of the entire article is very poor. Authors should have created headings as follows: 1. Methods : here authors should clearly state source of information (naming the different search domains), criteria for selecting some and rejecting other medicinal plants. Etc. 2. Results: (a) authors should have presented most of the data in tables which including: scientific name, common name, family, parts used, extraction solvents/fraction, possible active compounds, in vitro/in vivo model, parasite used, IC₅₀ /MIC, reference etc. (b) authors should have classified and presented the medicinal plants region by region eg West-Africa, East Africa, Southern Africa etc. 3. Discussion: authors did not discuss any of the medicinal plant under review. Authors seem to merely copy what the original authors of the papers had reported. This is not good enough. Authors should discuss what others have reported highlighting breakthrough or	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	shortcoming, and thus suggesting way forward.	
Minor REVISION comments	Title: The title of this article will be more appropriate as “African Medicinal Plants with Potential Antitrypanosomal Properties: A Review”. The phrase Natural Products does not fit since the authors failed to report isolated compounds whose chemical structures have been elucidated, and there are many of such compounds. Abstract: The abstract should be restructure to bring out the beauty of the title and make reading more interesting. It should briefly include the background of the subject matter, major objective, methodology, results, recommendations/suggestions, and conclusion. Introduction: Paragraph 2 & 3 (line 50-68) should be recast and come before paragraph 1. Paragraph 4 on chemotherapy should be expanded by addition of more references and become paragraph 3. Life cycle of Trypanosome: not necessary so should be removed entirely.	
Optional/General comments	The authors’ efforts are humble and encouraging but the article can be improved upon to make it much better.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Nigeria