

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	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	
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.	
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.	
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.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	David Chukwuma Nwikwe
Department, University & Country	Kings University, Nigeria