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**Reviewer’s report:**

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct) The authors should elaborate a little on the previous findings related to motility and lantana camara scice the question is not a new one. In this respect I refer to the findings of Pass & Heath 1978 and Pass et al, 1979 and MC Sweeney & pass 1983.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
Can the authors use in the title of the manuscript motility instead of kinetics. Purification of the constituents of the plant is important to understand the mode of action (as anti-motility drug). This will add a lot to our present knowledge.

**What next?:** Accept after discretionary revisions

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No
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