



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The results has to be rechecked/revalidated. 1. When the the results of 300, 600, and 1200mg treatment groups are similar to control how do the authors interpret that eg. Serum testosterone concentration (ng/ml) in control is 1.7 and that of group C and D are 1.5. Only group B showed 0.5 same with testicular protein control and Group C. only group B and D are different. There is no uniform trend has been observed. How do the author justify the results. So the results has to be revalidated According the discussion has to be done	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Paper can be accepted after modification of the results	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	SRM University, Kattankulathur, India