

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.	The article is concise and very well written especially on the effect of Trypanosoma brucei brucei. The manuscript give a deep insight into the effects of Alstonia boonei and Morinda lucida on the kidney and the effect on Trypanosoma brucei brucei. The authors' research is very relevant to the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes its 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.	Its comprehensive enough	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Nil	
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 extract of Alstonia boonei and Morinda lucida would be a viable treatment option for Trypanosoma brucei brucei. The manuscript give a deep insight into the effects of Alstonia boonei and Morinda lucida on the kidney and the effect on Trypanosoma brucei brucei. The authors' research is very relevant to the scientific community.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Well written article	

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:	Tawari Erebi Patricia
Department, University & Country	Niger Delta University, Nigeria