

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JABB_110330 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Immunomodulating potential of Ekebergia capensis in murine Schistosoma mansoni juvenile and adult infection |
| Type of the Article | |

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>1. The manuscript puts forward the ability of <i>Ekebergia capensis</i> in improving immunity of host against infection by schistosomiasis mansoni parasites. Since PZQ is the only viable in use drug for the control of Schistosomiasis and is riddled with shortcomings, this work then provides a suggest of a natural product in boosting the immunity of host against infection.</p> <p>2. The title is accurate and fitting</p> <p>3. The abstract has excerpts from the introduction, methodology results and discussions and closes with a conclusion thus is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. All subsections are relevant</p> <p>5. Manuscript is scientifically sound</p> <p>6. There needs to be more referencing, and most of the referencing is quite old or too old to be accepted. There exists new and recent information of this sources thus an urge to have them replaced and cite methodology section on experimental procedures</p> <p>7. Consider the addition of visual aids in the results section Example instead of all the writing under "Effect of treatment with <i>E. capensis</i> at 7 weeks p.i on Th1/Th2/Th17 cytokines" consider using a stacked bar chart or line graph</p> <p>8. Update references in the Discussion section-quite old</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Minor changes especially in the writing of the methodology should follow the past perfect tense in third person. The tense throughout the body of work is not consistent, it should be reporting findings thus past perfect tense, where applicable</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Try to make the ideas more fluent especially for the introduction, complete one train of thought before beginning another, minor fluency adjustment nothing major</p> | |

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) |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Peredy Khwesa |
| Department, University & Country | Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia |