

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Immunology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJI_99683
Title of the Manuscript:	Analgesic and Anti-inflammatory Potentials of Anthocleista grandiflora wood Bark in Albino Rats.
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.journalaji.com/index.php/AJI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. The author(s) actually evaluated the analgesic and anti-inflammatory potentials of <i>Anthocleista grandiflora</i> wood bark in albino rats.</p> <p>Yes, it is suitable.</p> <p>Yes, it's comprehensive but author(s) did not detailed what they did in methodology especially with the animal models.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, but result in Table 2: A particular group was omitted.</p> <p>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>In the methodology, the author(s) said a total of twenty five (25) adult albino rats were divided into five (5) groups of five (5) rats in each group, but in Table 2: only four (4) groups were indicated.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
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:	Assumpta Ugbonma Ugenyi
Department, University & Country	University of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, Nigeria