

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Neurology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORRIN_130414
Title of the Manuscript:	Microstructural, Immunoreactivity and Biochemical Studies of the Cerebellum After Artequin Administration in Adult Wistar Rats
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL ARTICLE

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is original with meaningful information to the knowledge of tackling cerebral malaria using Artequin (ATQ). It should be accepted after the authors have provided a meaningful rebuttal to the observations highlighted.	All observations are carefully corrected, updated or redesigned as required
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
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 comprehensive and covers the contents of the research findings, but needs minor corrections to the highlighted points.	The minor corrections have been effected
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript conveys meaningful knowledge required in the study of cerebral malaria. It shows how the protozoa can be managed in lab experiments using ACTs, particularly ATQ.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references provided are sufficient for the research, but some need to be reviewed as highlighted in the manuscript and general comments.	Reviews have been made as suggested
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language of the article is scholarly for publication. However, some choice of words need professionalism as highlighted in the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The authors need to address/respond to these general comments: i. Why were different font sizes used? ii. Why were different referencing styles used in the reference list? iii. No evidence supporting ethical clearance. iv. Some references were cited but not listed, why some were listed twice. v. Some figures were mislabeled and in disorder, e.g., figure 3. vi. Histological plates should not be labelled as figures.	i. The font sizes are according to the journal's template ii. The references are updated/corrected to be uniform iii. Not applicable iv. This has been updated v. This has been effected vi. The term figures are changed to read plate in the photomicrographs

[Review Form 3](#)

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>	Not applicable