



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_23591
Title of the Manuscript:	Anti-Trypanosomal effect of Neem seed oil in mice infected with Trypanosoma Brucei Brucei.
Type of Article:	Original Research Articles

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The authors has done reasonable corrections on the manuscript as it demanded however concerning the sample size used in the experiment, the authors cited some references "See maduka and Okoye (2002); Maduka et al. (2003) in Vascular pharmacology" as a basis for their choice of sample size. I want to emphasize here that sample sizes are determined prior to experiment with the use of methods (see Jaykaran and Kanthania, 2013). This is to ensure adequate representation of a group at the same time avoid unnecessary waste of resources in case of excessive sample size (see Fitts, 2011). As a matter of necessity authors of recent articles are requested to include methods of determining sample size and its justification in their paper assessed for publication see(Kilkenny et al., 2010 and Jaykaran and Kanthania, 2013). I therefore refer the authors to these citations which are more recent than his citations, mind you science is not dynamic hence researchers ought to keep up with the trend in research.	The choice of 5 rats per group was determined prior to the experiment. We only quoted the reference to show that many high impact Journals we have published before accepts 5 per group. I have gone through Kilkenny et al.(2010). The said reference did not give an absolute/minimum number of animals that can be used for an in vivo experiments. It only stated that the total number of animals used should be stated. The reviewer should note that the referred guidelines are not intended to be mandatory or absolute prescriptive nor to standardise or formalise the structure of reporting. Please see Suru and ugwu (2015); Karunasree et al (2015), Olaniya et al. (2016). These recent publication did not use more than 6 rats per group. We maintain that the 5 rats per group used in our study are statistically good for comparison. I humbly appreciate the reviewer's thoroughness in editing.