

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Immunology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJI_127386
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Alstonia boonei and Morinda lucida in Renal Histology of wistar rats infected with Trypanosoma brucei brucei
Type of the 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 '**lack of Novelty**', 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

<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)
<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>	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the potential medicinal benefits of <i>Alstonia boonei</i> and <i>Morinda lucida</i> in renal damage caused by <i>Trypanosoma brucei brucei</i> infection in Wistar rats. The exploration of traditional plant-based treatments could contribute significantly to alternative therapeutic strategies. However, the study would benefit from addressing methodological weaknesses to enhance its reliability and reproducibility. Overall, it presents a promising avenue for further research in medical parasitology.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title of the article is mostly suitable	
<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>	Need more clarification in the methodology part, Some repetitive phrases and specific details about histological findings could overwhelm the reader in an abstract. Simplify by focusing on the most impactful results. Consider summarizing key findings more succinctly and add the conclusion part in the abstract.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The subsections within each section are not clear or well-organized	
<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>	The manuscript presents certain shortcomings that affect its scientific correctness and overall robustness. The methodological structure is notably poor, lacking clear organization under essential headings such as "Plant Materials and Extraction," "Phytochemical Analysis of the Plant Parts," "Parasites," "Animals," "Experimental Design," and "Histopathological Examination." These headings would provide clarity and enable readers to understand the experimental setup and procedures more effectively. Moreover, the absence of a well-defined experimental design raises concerns; it is crucial for the authors to specify the experimental design and groups used, the treatment regimen, indicating the doses administered to different groups and the timeline for the interventions. Information regarding the weight, age, and environmental conditions of the rats used is also missing, which is critical for assessing the experimental context and ensuring reproducibility. Additionally, the manuscript includes abbreviations that are not defined prior to their use, which could lead to confusion among readers. Overall, these inadequacies highlight the need for significant revisions to enhance the scientific integrity and clarity of the research presented.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Need to add more updated reference	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	grammatically need to be well reviewed there are a lot of grammar mistakes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Asmaa Mostafa Ammar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ain Shams University, Egypt</b>