



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_14318
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Aqueous Leaf Extract of Cissampelos mucronata on Testicular Function Indices in Wistar Rats
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This work reported the anti-androgenic and anti-steroidogenic effect of <i>Cissampelos mucronata</i> aqueous leaf extract on male wistar rats, through measuring the indexes of body weight, testes-body weight ratio, cholesterol and glycogen concentrations. The results sounds nice. However, after carefully reading the MS, My specific comments are: 1. How do the authors confirm the oral administration doses of aqueous leaf extract of <i>Cissampelos mucronata</i> for the experiments? 2. What compounds exist there in the aqueous leaf extract of <i>Cissampelos mucronata</i>? 3. What are the minimal and maximal oral administration dose of the aqueous leaf extract of <i>Cissampelos mucronata</i>, respectively? Also, what is the safety oral administration dose?	The oral administration of the extract was carried out by force-feeding the wistar rats using cannula attached to graduated syringe. This has reflected in the manuscript Data on phytochemical screening of the plant extract have been added. Based on the ethnobotanical survey on the plant carried out prior to the study on the administration of the extracts in humans, the safety oral dose of the extract was established at 600 mg/kg. The choice of the lower and higher doses above the recommended dosage was to establish the effect (if any) of those doses on the parameters investigated.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	4. The number of rat samples (only 5 rats) in each group is too small for medicine experiments.	Although a higher population size of the experimental rats per group could have given a higher degree of freedom, we are of the opinion that 5 replica per group could provide the minimum evidence to justify the findings of the study.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		