### 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:
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### Part 1: Review Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Compulsory** REVISION comments | Material and method section was poorly written.  

Line 92:  
I can not understand that “Acute toxicity of Kigelia Africana in mice” or rat?  
48 animals were used for acute toxicity tests  
where are results?  

Line 96 Why is extract dose mg/kg ? or mg/mL  

56 animals were used according to table 2?  
An additional 24 animals were used for 2 replicates  
Total number of animals used is inconsistent  

Is there permit from Animal experiments ethics committee? Permit number?  

What are the basic bioactive properties of the K. africana?  

Discussion section was poorly written.  
There isn’t statistical markers of bar diagram . |

| **Minor** REVISION comments | |
| **Optional/General** comments | |
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