



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_58386
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYTOCHEMICAL SCREENING, ANTIOXIDANT ACTIVITY AND INHIBITORY POTENTIAL OF FIVE PLANTS FOR POSSIBLE ANTILEISHMANIAL ACTIVITY
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper contains many spelling and grammatical errors. Please conduct a complete English review. 2. In the title, the part "antioxidant activity and inhibitory potential" was not done. Only the analysis of plant components was performed. None of the references cites anything related to this. Please change the title of the article to be more in line with what has been done 3. The name <i>L. chagasi</i> is no longer used. The correct now is <i>L. infantum</i> New World. The nomenclature was changed with phylogenetic studies published in 2014 and 2019. 4. in the eleventh line of the introduction the reference is missing, and in the subsequent sentence the reference is wrong. It does not refer to visceral leishmaniasis. 5. The whole part of the sentence that starts with "Numerous plants have been screened for antiparasite..." references are missing for the whole part. 6. the last sentence of topic 2.2 has references outside the rules. and the references cited are also not included in the final list 7. review the first sentence of the discussion 8. in the second paragraph of the discussion explain to whom the conclusion that the extracts cited are compounds against Leishmania parasites is attributed 9. review the conclusion, because the anti-leishmaniscidal property of the compounds found has not been tested. Or at least it is not described in any previous part of this paper. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. discussion and results should be treated on separate topics, because they are already placed separately in the text. 2. In figure 1, in components 1, 8 and 10 the names are superimposed on part of the structures 3. Use discussion as number 4, and conclusion as number 5 	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Roberta Carvalho de Freitas e Azevedo
Department, University & Country	Santo Amaro University, Brazil