

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Immunology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJI_122015</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Stereological Studies on Ameliorative Role of Ethanolic Extracts of Vernonia Amygdalina and Gongronema Latifolium Against Streptozocin- Induced Diabetic Splenic Tissue Damage in Wistar Rats.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This study is important as it explores the potential protective effects of <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> and <i>Gongronema latifolium</i> on STZ-induced diabetic rats. The use of stereology to assess spleen volume is a notable strength, adding quantitative rigor to the histological observations.</p> <p>The study appears well-designed, with appropriate methodologies and clear results. However, enhancing the detail in certain sections (e.g., ethical guidelines, tissue processing) would improve reproducibility and clarity. Overall, the study contributes valuable data on the potential benefits of these plant extracts in diabetic models, warranting further investigation.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>YES</b></p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>YES</b></p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>YES</b></p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive approach in assessing the ameliorative effects of ethanolic extracts of <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> and <i>Gongronema latifolium</i> on STZ-induced diabetic splenic damage. The use of stereological analysis adds a quantitative dimension to the study, allowing for precise evaluation of changes in splenic tissue architecture. Additionally, the comparison with established treatments, such as metformin, further strengthens the scientific validity of the findings, demonstrating the potential of these extracts in restoring splenic function in diabetic conditions. The manuscript also aligns its results with existing literature, thereby enhancing its credibility.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p><b>YES</b></p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>YES, Need very minor revisions</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Gana Manjusha Kondepudi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Vignan Institute of Pharmaceutical Technology, India</b>