

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</a>
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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	The research aimed to screen plant-based antimalarial treatment for efficacy and safety. This is important as findings will help provide data needed to validate their usefulness, and identify potential risks associated with their use. Phytochemical screening also aims to identify relevant bioactive compounds that can be important for drug development.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is quite suitable. I suggest Anti-Malarial to be written as antimalarial	
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.	Abstract is comprehensive, but requires English language check. Example: "of" after evaluate, wrong use of sentence case	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, but whole manuscript needs English language check, typographical errors.	
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 materials and methods have not been properly presented. 1. Experimental design mentioned PCV, body weight, temperature, synergism potential of the plant extracts, acute toxicity were evaluated. But methods were not provided, findings were not reported or mentioned in the discussion. There is no information in the manuscript to show these assessments were done. 2. And if acute toxicity was not done how were the 3 doses of the plant extracts determined?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, methods and references for materials and methods is not sufficient.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, quality of report and English language needs to be checked	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

#### 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:	Omagha Rachel
Department, University & Country	University of Lagos, Nigeria