---

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

---

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

Good

Remarks

Title completely match the manuscript so its completely perfect

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.

Regular

Remarks

TOPIC-Perfect

Background- Within word limit and perfect

Methods- Within word limit and perfect

Result- This portion is lengthy so kindly write it it in 2-3 sentence

Conclusion- Perfect

* Modifications in results needed .Please explain 2-3 line only

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Good

Remarks

Introduction is perfect as it explain the background, objective and hypothesis of the research.

Word count within limits.

* Does not require any modification

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.

Good

Remarks

Methodology portion is divided into different sub sections which makes it completely perfect ,within word limits and no modifications needed.

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

No

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.

Good

Remarks

Tables and graphs are perfect as well as it is properly cited even figures quality is good and cited as well. No modification needed

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

Regular

Remarks

Discussion need revision .Please co-relate your findings with latest published articles so that discussion portion can become strong

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

Good

Remarks

Conclusion is perfect no modification needed

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.

Poor

Remarks

Put all the references in sequence and cite them in proper order like after 7 directly 23 so after 7,8 should be there

Few references does not follow Vancouver format

DOI missing

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?

Needs some language corrections

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it

Discussion portion needed to be improved by correlating the research with latest published articles

In abstract- Result portion too lengthy

References

---

---

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

---

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

Regular

Remarks

Please see my comments.

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.

Regular

Remarks

Please see my comments.

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Poor

Remarks

Please see my comments.

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.

Poor

Remarks

Please see my comments.

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

Yes

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.

Poor

Remarks

Please see my comments.

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

Poor

Remarks

Please see my comments.

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

Regular

Remarks

Please see my comments.

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.

Regular

Remarks

Please see my comments.

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?

Requires a thorough assessment of grammar and spelling

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it

Manuscript Number: 5524

Title: Antimalarial Activity of Canarium Odontophyllum Leaf Extracts Against Erythrocytes Infected with Plasmodium Berghei NK65 Using Plasmodium Lactate Dehydrogenase (pLDH) and SYBR Green 1 Fluorescence Assay

Journal: Microbes, Infection and Chemotherapy

Minor comments:

The author appraised this paper by evaluating the antimalarial activity of Canarium odontophyllum leaf extracts against erythrocytes infected with Plasmodium berghei NK65 using Plasmodium lactate dehydrogenase and SYBR green 1 fluorescence assay.

However, your article is inadequately presented. Furthermore, there are many problems in the different sections as well.

Although the article has scientific rigor, several minor flows need to be improved before publication.

1. Authors are advised to amend the article title into a more up-front arrangement.

2. The abstract section is unsuitable—no focus point in the abstract section.

3. Rewrite the methods, results, and conclusion (in the abstract) in a more straightforward form. Many sentences are fragmented.

4. Authors are suggested to use the full form when used for the first time throughout the manuscript.

5. The introduction section is poorly written. Authors are suggested to develop the introduction section by adding the literature related to malaria. Four paragraphs should be okay.

6. The introduction section is inapplicable. Need to change the introduction considerably. Try to include the existing research limitations also, how the present research unravels those limits.

7. Need to arrange the introduction section logically—very few references are cited in this section. Also, the reference serial is not correct.

8. Also, the first to fourth paragraph is very poor, long, and redundant. This type of writings is basic and not acceptable.

9. Delete old references from the introduction section.

10. Sources (manufacture name, city, country) need to mention all the chemicals and reagents used in this manuscript.

11. Material and methods are written without proper references. Need a logical flow of the writings with enough references.

12. Some of the methods need detailed description (e.g., PLDH assay & SYBR Green 1 Fluorescence assay, Statistical analysis, etc.).

13. Statistical analysis section needs to elaborate (what test, test details, significance, software's, etc.).

14. Check all the symbols (degree centigrade, micromolar, etc.).

15. The results section needs to be improved by adding significant results.

16. The writing of results is good. Need to maintain a logical flow of the writings.

17. Many grammatically problematic sentences are in the results section, which must be checked and corrected precisely.

18. The discussion is feeble. Please, include the data from other sources about related works.

19. The conclusion needs to address future perspectives.

20. Novelty of the work should be added by the author in the conclusion section.

21. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript.

22. English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.

23. Why did authors choose Canarium Odontophyllum?

---

Dear Prof/ Dr,

Hereby I stated the changes made accordingly as per review made.

Thank you.

**Changes made according to Reviewer suggestions.**

| | Original | Latest | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| Title | Antimalarial Activity of Canarium Odontophyllum Leaf Extracts Against Erythrocytes Infected with Plasmodium Berghei NK65 Using Plasmodium Lactate Dehydrogenase (pLDH) and SYBR Green 1 Fluorescence Assay | Ex vivo Study of Antimalarial Activity of Canarium Odontophyllum Leaf Extracts Against Plasmodium Berghei NK65 | |
| Abstract | | | -Rephrasing and addition of information |
| Introduction | | | Highlighted yellow- addition of information and rearrangement of sentences. |
| Material & Method | Unorganised method flow | -More organised method flow<br>1. Stating the chemical origin used<br>2. Details on PLDH ASSAY<br>3. Statistical analysis | Highlighted yellow- rearrange and addition of information |
| Result | 3.2 pLDH assay | 3.2 IC50 reading on 5% parasitemia using pLDH assay. | Highlight blue- specific title for result<br>Highlighted yellow- rearrange and addition of information |
| Discussion | | | Background on *Canarium odontophyllum* leaf and studies related. |
| Conclusion | | | -future plan or study for this plant |
| References | -UKM format | -Vancouver format | |