

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_123281
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Skin Toxicity in Female Rabbits and Antifungal Activity of Piliostigma thonningii
Type of the Article	

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.	I appreciate this manuscript for its focus on a promising natural alternative for fungal infections. The authors effectively highlight the need for new treatment approaches due to the limitations of existing therapies. Additionally, their focus on the safety of Piliostigma thonningii for topical application is crucial, as it addresses a potential concern for its use in medicine. The study's results could have significant implications for the development of novel, more sustainable and patient-friendly treatments for cutaneous mycoses.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	While it accurately reflects the two main aspects of the study (skin toxicity and antifungal activity), it could be more specific and informative. Here's a suggested alternative: "Evaluation of Antifungal Activity and Skin Toxicity of Piliostigma thonningii in Female Rabbits"	
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 abstract is generally comprehensive, providing a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions. However, I would suggest adding a brief statement about the significance of the study at the beginning. This could highlight the growing public health concern of fungal infections and the potential benefits of exploring natural alternatives like Piliostigma thonningii.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate. The manuscript follows a common structure for research papers	
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 manuscript demonstrates a strong foundation in scientific methodology and rigor. The authors have employed well-established techniques, such as the double dilution method for antifungal testing and the Draize test for skin toxicity assessment. The inclusion of controls and the use of statistical analysis to interpret the results further enhance the scientific validity of the study. Additionally, the manuscript references relevant literature, supporting the claims made and demonstrating a thorough understanding of the existing research in this field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most of the references are recent and sufficient	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is recommended for publication subject to minor modifications.	

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:	Iserhienrhien Lucky Osafanme
Department, University & Country	Edo State University, Nigeria