

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_125219
Title of the Manuscript:	CYTOTOXIC AND ANTI-INFLAMMATORY PROPERTIES OF TWO MEDICINAL PLANT RECIPIENTS, ACPHYX AND CHRYFA, USED IN TRADITIONAL MEDICINE OF BURKINA FASO
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	While the article presents some interesting ideas as it covers both <i>in vivo</i> and <i>in vitro</i> studies of plant decoctions, it lacks sufficient justification for its claims. Providing additional context or data could greatly enhance the overall credibility and persuasiveness of the piece. A more thorough exploration of the topic would help readers better understand the nuances involved so that it can be reproducible for future research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No CYTOTOXIC AND ANTI-INFLAMMATORY PROPERTIES OF TWO MEDICINAL PLANT DECOCTIONS, ACPHYX AND CHRYFA, USED IN TRADITIONAL MEDICINE OF BURKINA FASO	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The ingredients of the decoction are missing The anti-inflammatory (anti-edema and antiallergic) activity results should be briefly stated. Vague conclusion.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The reason behind using the decoctions was not discussed in the introduction. The amount of each ingredient was not stated. The author should perform the MTT assay 24 hours to 72 hours and display the graph to show the cytotoxicity result, different concentrations were used for DU145 unlike the other cell line and should have used positive control to compare the cytotoxicity effect. State the number and the species of mouse used.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The paper should be proofread.	
Optional/General comments	Extensive tests were conducted on the plants chosen but it would be great if it is properly justified and discussed the relationship between the result and the future recommendation	

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kokila Thiagarajah
Department, University & Country	Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Malaysia