

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_96324
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of In vivo acute, subacute toxicity and in vitro antimicrobial activities of crude ethanolic stem bark extract of Anonidium mannii
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:

(<https://www.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Not really suitable. I suggest the title to be "Evaluation of <i>In vivo</i> toxicity and <i>In vitro</i> antimicrobial activities of crude ethanolic stem bark extract of <i>Anonidium manii</i>".</p> <p>3. Yes. I made slight corrections and highlighted the corrections in yellow.</p> <p>4. Yes it looks ok.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes the references are ok.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>A. I made some minor corrections in the manuscript and highlighted it in yellow.</p> <p>B. The author has to correct the words/sentences I highlighted in red (the sections where I made the red highlight are listed below).</p> <p>2.1. Materials: I highlighted "accu check" in red because it was not complete. For example, is it accu check strip, accu check glucometer etc. Please mention the exact material of accu check used.</p> <p>3.4.2. Variations in the average mass of batches of rats Please include the symbol (*) in the figure (Fig. 2) where the result was significant .</p> <p>3.4.3. Average masses of the internal organs of the batches of rats during the experiment Please include the symbol (*) in the figures (Fig. 3 and Fig. 4) where the result was significant .</p> <p>3.4.4. Biochemical parameters of rats "Analysis of the biochemical parameters of the rats' blood (Table 4) after studying the subacute toxicity showed that the creatinine level". Please complete the sentence highlighted in red in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>None</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rita Maneju Sunday
Department, University & Country	Nigeria