

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_126013
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the Anti-Malarial Activity of Garcinia kola Ethanolic Extracts in Treatment of Plasmodium berghei-infected Mice
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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 is a very important piece of research especially for public health, and pharmaceutical experts, considering the incidence and prevalence of malaria disease in Africa.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes However, I would suggest the title "Evaluation of the Anti-Malarial Activity of <i>Garcinia kola</i> Ethanolic Extracts in The Prevention And Treatment of <i>Plasmodium berghei</i> -infected Mice This is because the research did not just work on the therapeutic effect of these extracts but also on the prophylactic ability.	
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 okay but will be better with a little bit of information on the methods employed rather than the results. Also, the phytochemicals should not be in such detailed description in the abstract section but in the body of the work.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes they are mostly accurate except for the repetition of plant collection and preparation section. Sections 2.2 (Experimental Design) and 2.2.1 (<i>Collection and Preparation of Plant Materials</i>). should be reconciled appropriately	
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 model and experimental design is robust and appear to be correct within the premise of the aim of the study. The employment of several control systems in their model and also the use of pre-existing and well drafted guidelines makes the study rigorous and robust enough that the outcomes should be trustworthy.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references needs a little adjustment starting from the in-text citations around the discussion section. Also, the second reference(1967) should be outdated. Finally, while it appears that the in-text citation employs the Vancouver's system, the bibliography appears to be more of Harvard's system. More-so, the references are haphazard and not in a numerical sequence.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is. However. there are cases of grammatical incorrectness that I believe will be taken care of by the editorial crew.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, this is a good and important scientific research work that needs proper adjustments.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chijioke Noris Ezinwa
Department, University & Country	University of Nigeria, Nigeria