



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_45455
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIMALARIA AND HEMATOLOGICAL PROPERTIES OF ETHANOLIC LEAVE EXTRACT OF PENNISETUM PURPARUM ON PLASMODIUM BERGHEI INFECTED MICE
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The language used is full of pitfalls. 2. Methods used have not been described well. Parasite count is incorrect. Instead it should be % parasitemia. Route of drug administration is missing. 3. It is not clear which day parasite count is given in table 1. 4. What is the reason for higher dose to be less effective than lower dose of drug? 	<p>Language use has been rechecked and corrected for grammatical and syntactic errors</p> <p>Reason for higher dose less effectiveness than lower dose is quite unclear. But that's what we had, and we have to report it as such; even though it gets us thinking.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Yes there are ethical issues since there is the mention of rats in Abstract while elsewhere in the manuscript there is the mention of the use of mice.</p>	