



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_35105
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIPLASMODIAL POTENTIAL OF COMBINATION THERAPY OF METHANOLIC BARK EXTRACTS OF Terminalia. avicennioides and Anogeisus leiocarpus AND ITS EFFECT ON HAEMATOLOGICAL PARAMETERS IN MICE INFECTED WITH Plasmodium berghei
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The number of the authorization of Ethical Committee of Animals Use in Researches is needed to the publication of this work. Please, insert this number. I suggest that the conclusion be reviewed. Despite the dosage of 400 mg/Kg be the most efficient to promotes the reduction of parasites in blood, this dosage was also able to promotes dangerous effects on mice. This way, it cannot be considered the best dosage. On the other hand, the dosage that was able to promotes a similar effect on the parasitaemia compared to the observed on the group control positive, was also able to promotes an increase in body weight of mice. Thus with these data is possible to conclude that the best dosage of combination treatment with extracts is at <u>100 mg/Kg</u>.	The comments have been considered and effected accordingly. The comments have been considered and effected where necessary



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	There are some considerations inside the manuscript. It is needed to correct the English - where it is "previous study", insert "previous studies", once two references are cited. It will be good to insert some information about these cited previous studies. I suggest a brief comparison of the present results to the obtained in your previous studies highlighting some evidences that allow to show if there is some extract most responsible for the observed effects in mice at present study. The number of the authorization of Ethical Committee of Animals Use in Researches is needed to the publication of this work.	This has been done These have been done
Optional/General comments	The manuscript shows a high level of investigation. The association of both extracts that was previously tested in previous studies demonstrated a consistence of the research group.	