



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_47595
Title of the Manuscript:	PROPHYLATIC EFFECTS OF SOME NIGERIAN HIGHER FUNGI ON MALARIA PARASITE, PLASMODIUM BERGHEI BERGHEI IN BALB/C STRAIN ALBINO MICE.
Type of the 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The author(s) provided interesting results of “PROPHYLATIC EFFECTS OF SOME NIGERIAN HIGHER FUNGI ON MALARIA PARASITE, PLASMODIUM BERGHEI BERGHEI IN BALB/C STRAIN ALBINO MICE”. I’m impressed by the writing style and good use of English language. However the referencing style, both the in-text and reference list need to be reviewed to reflect a true Vancouver referencing style.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The in-text reference numbers should be enclosed in parenthesis not brackets, eg., [2] and [35,36,37].</li> <li>The names of authors mentioned in the Discussion and other sections of the write up should be removed and replaced with their list of reference numbers in parenthesis only.</li> <li>The reference list should reflect true Vancouver reference style, eg.;</li> </ul> <p>7. Ojiezeh, T.I., Ibeh, N.I., Opedun, D.O., Udoh, S.J. Malaria Endemicity among pregnant women in urban and semi-urban areas in Southwest, Nigeria. American EurAsian Journal of Scientific Research. 2010;5(3):207-213.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The statement on line 43 is not very clear: Twenty-two (22) grammes of 4-5 weeks old of BALB/c strain albino mice (<i>Mus musculus</i>) were divided into 30 groups.</li> <li>On the photomicrographs Plate 2 (A) and Plate 4 (A) the arrows are not pointing to renal corpuscles as labelled. The arrows should be adjusted to point directly to the renal corpuscles.</li> <li>Plate 5 (A) is not liver tissue as indicated on the title. It is kidney tissue. The arrow is also not directly pointing to the renal corpuscle. Therefore the mixed up should be corrected.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	A well written manuscript.	

**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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Abdu Umar</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Nigeria</i></b>