



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	2015_JAMPS_18138
Title of the Manuscript:	Ex vivo antiplasmodial activity of plant extracts used in traditional medicine in Côte d'Ivoire
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	Line 76-78: No mention of ethical approval for this study was done. It is mandatory to state the name of the Ethics Committee that evaluate the study and it is recommended to present the report number. Ethical Issue: Yes, this manuscript deals with human blood collection, but no mention of ethical approval of the study was done.	
Minor REVISION comments	No mention to results from <i>E. floribundus</i> was made in abstract. Line 14: correct sentence case. Line 53: correct "...was held..." for "were held". Lines 53-57: was a voucher specimen of each plant deposited elsewhere? Were national laws in regards to plant material collection followed? I suggest a statement should be added at the end of this paragraph. Line 77: Italicise <i>P. falciparum</i>. Line 91: correct "antimalaria". Line 172: correct "angaist". Lines 192, 203: include explication of all acronyms in the table legend. Line 200: adjust alignment of rows in table 2. Explain why the aqueous extract of <i>E. floribundus</i> was not submitted to organic extraction, as it was for <i>T. glaucescens</i>.	We submitted to organic extraction only parts of plants whose aqueous extracts gave the best results during the first stage of experimentation
Optional/General comments		