

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78212
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Leishmania Species on Immune Response Against Malaria Parasite in Malaria Leishmania Coinfections
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1- The authors concentrated mainly on experimental and immunological studies. We suggest to include more clinical human-based studies in this regard if available.2- We think that authors need to illustrate more how the co-infection is variable clinically from single infection by discussing further details about the clinical signs , hospital courses, challenges in management, mortality etc. depending on clinical references such as number 4 and 8 or any more references.3- The conclusion is too short. Summary of paper hypothesis in clear statements is important for readers. I.e the experimental and clinical variabilities between single infection co-infection by different species of malaria with different species of leishmania or summarize it in a table.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- It seems better if authors compare between malaria-cutaneous leishmania and malaria-visceral leishmania co-infection in two different paragraphs in discussion.- A figures that explain the usual immune response to malaria and leishmania infection will facilitate understanding of authors messages.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Better to be reviewed by an immunologist.- It seems that the authors were trapped with limited number of words according to journal regulations. Such topics could require more space to illustrate its hypothesis. 300-500 words more will be enough.	

Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Nabil Soliman Dhayhi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>King Fahad Central Hospital, Saudi Arabia</i>