

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGMB_125848
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Genetic Landscape of Plasmodium falciparum PfKelch13 Gene Polymorphisms in Côte d'Ivoire Following a Decade of Artemisinin -based Combination Therapy.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**Lac k of Nove l ty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers : <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The study highlights PfKelch13 gene polymorphisms in Côte d'Ivoire and its relation to the emergence of resistance to Artemisinin-based combination therapies in the malarial infection in a scientific and systematic manner. The candidate has put in a substantial amount of effort in carrying out this research and is commended for completing it.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable.	
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.	Yes, the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it is appropriate, but suggests: 1- In the study population and sampling subsection, identify the artemisinin derivatives that were given to the patients in clinical trials. 2- In the DNA isolation and genotyping subsection, there is an error in the sequence of K13_N1_R and the primer reference must be indicated. 3- In the results, include a figure of agarose gel for amplification of PfKelch13 fragment. 4- If possible, include a figure that shows the sequence point mutation. 5- Discussion needs recent references to compare the results.	
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.	I think that this manuscript is scientifically robust because it is based on real malaria patients, practical experiments, and real results. The manuscript is sequential, flexible, and well-organized. The manuscript objectives are clear, the methods content is acceptable with enough information to repeat the experiments, the results are comprehensive, and the results were discussed in a scientific and objective manner but needs to update references.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	In general, recent references are needed to enhance the results.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is suitable.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I value the work presented in this manuscript. With some improvements of the interpretation as suggested above, I believe the manuscript will be in a better form.	

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:	Mayada Hussein Ali
Department, University & Country	Institute of Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology for the Postgraduate Studies, University of Baghdad, Iraq