

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Immunology
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

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.	This manuscript is highly relevant as it explores the effects of plant-based extracts, specifically <i>Alstonia boonei</i> and <i>Morinda lucida</i> , on the renal histology of <i>Trypanosoma brucei brucei</i> infected rats. By providing insights into potential alternative therapies for African trypanosomiasis, the study addresses an urgent need for safe, affordable, and effective treatments, particularly in regions with limited access to conventional drugs. The findings contribute to ethnopharmacology and the growing interest in plant-based medicine.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it clearly outlines the study's focus.	
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 comprehensive, but it could be improved by emphasizing: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The significance of the findings. 2. Clear comparisons between the effects of <i>A. boonei</i> and <i>M. lucida</i>. 3. Key numerical or statistical outcomes to strengthen the impact. 4. Suggested revision: Include the quantitative efficacy of <i>A. boonei</i> compared to the control group. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure and subsections are well-organized and align with standard scientific reporting. Each section progresses logically, supporting clarity and coherence.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust. The methodology, including phytochemical screening and histopathological analysis, is sound and well-detailed. The inclusion of appropriate controls (untreated and treated groups) ensures reliable conclusions. The correlation between the phytochemical properties and their effects on renal histology is well-articulated, reinforcing the manuscript's technical soundness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant and adequate but could benefit from the inclusion of more recent studies, particularly post-2020, to reflect the latest advancements in phytochemical and anti-trypanosomal research.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Khadija Muktar Sukola
Department, University & Country	Kaduna State University, Nigeria