

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_121838
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of the Potential Mechanisms of Anti-diarrhoeal Activities of ethanol extract of Polyantha logofolia Leave in Wistar Rat.
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

Compulsory 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.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it explores the potential mechanisms of anti-diarrheal activities of ethanol extract of Polyantha logofolia leaves in Wistar rats. Understanding such mechanisms can contribute to the development of new therapeutic agents for diarrheal diseases, which remain a major health concern globally	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate for the content of the manuscript. However, for clarity, it could be slightly modified to: "Evaluation of the Anti-Diarrhoeal Mechanisms of Ethanol Extract of Polyantha logofolia Leaves in Wistar Rats."	
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 generally comprehensive. However, it would benefit from a brief mention of the key findings or results to give readers a snapshot of the study's outcomes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and logically arranged, facilitating a clear understanding of the research conducted	
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 manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The experimental design is well-constructed, and the methodology is thoroughly detailed, allowing for reproducibility. The results are clearly presented, and the conclusions are supported by the data	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and appear to be recent. No additional references are needed at this time	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used in the manuscript is suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Khadija Muktar Sukola
Department, University & Country	Kaduna State University, Nigeria