



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_15169
Title of the Manuscript:	Toxicological evaluation of palm kernel oil (PKO) biodiesel-contaminated catfish on kidney of albino 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Manuscript should be typed in Arial font with strict adherence to the SDI format (specific font sizes). The Abstract should be structured following the format below: Aim: Study design: Place and Duration of study: Methodology: Result: how were the results expressed (Mean $\pm$ SD or SEM)? Conclusion: What is the author(s) definition of oxidative stress? Author(s) should insert the age and weight ranges of the experimental animals (Fish and Albino [species?] rats). How was the feed intake of the three groups measured? Where are their values and interpretations? Author(s) should present the organ: body weight ratio. Author(s) did not state how the grossed, fixed and processed the harvested organs.	Manuscript now appear in Arial font (size 12) The Abstract has been structured as advised and shaded in yellow. The weight ranges of the animals have been inserted. However, the animals were bought from another source, it may be difficult to ascertain the actual age. Daily feed intake was measured, values are included. This presented as relative weight in Fig 1 This is contained in the Drury and Wallington report of 1973.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Which technique was used in staining the tissues? Author(s) did not present the weight and photomicrographs of the liver of the groups. Author should present the individual exact P-values of the intergroup comparisons. For example: <table><tr><th>Groups</th><th>ALP</th><th>ACP</th><th>MDA</th><th>CAT</th></tr><tr><td>C vs BD.1</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.02</td><td>0.07</td><td>0.04</td></tr><tr><td>C vs BD.25</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>BD.1 vs BD.25</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> Authors should give proper explanations (as footnotes) to the values presented in each of the tables. Lines 261-262: Data from this study suggested that catfish exposed to biodiesel had no adverse effect on haematological properties of rats (Table 1). Line 299: “.....nephrocyte architecture without presenting anomalous haematological properties.” I find the above statements a bit contradictory to the values presented in table (1). Author should study the table very well and rephrase the above statement to make logical meaning. The figures (especially 1-4) were not properly labelled (Axis-wise; Concentration of what?) The figure legends were also not well presented. The diagnosis made on the photomicrographs (especially, figure 5 and 6) are not correct. It is clear that the individual(s) who read the	Groups	ALP	ACP	MDA	CAT	C vs BD.1	0.00	0.02	0.07	0.04	C vs BD.25					BD.1 vs BD.25					Kidney was the only organ studied in this report The post hoc test used is Duncan multiple range test with common P value 0.05 The footnotes are now included The sentence as been corrected appropriately The sentence has been rephrased The figure legend contains the biochemical measured, so it was considered as repetition to include in the axis.
Groups	ALP	ACP	MDA	CAT																		
C vs BD.1	0.00	0.02	0.07	0.04																		
C vs BD.25																						
BD.1 vs BD.25																						



SDI Review Form 1.6

	photomicrographs is not a histopathologist/ pathologist. Author(s) should re-evaluate the slides.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 56: "This study, however, is aimed at investigating the effect of consuming catfish exposed to...." What was the rationale behind the choice of Biodiesel administered to the fish? Lines 91-93: "...the experiment protocol was approved by Federal University of Petroleum Resources, Effurun (FUPRE), Nigeria ethics committee." Author(s) should provide the reference number of the ethical approval given by the Nigeria Ethics Committee. How were the animals assessed for overall health condition? How did the author(s) test for deepness of anaesthesia? Line 111: "....Jollow et al. [12] was.." Line 137: ".....Generally, concentrations of urea, creatinine," The sentence above appears incomplete. Author(s) should complete it. Line 255: "....synthetic chemicals, which are non-biodegradable, accumulate....." Author(s) should remove very old citations and references and replace them with more recent ones. Line 341: " with 5 mm³".	The statement has been corrected The chosen concentration represent the real situation of environmental impact Ethics number is not currently issued, however, the committee on ethics must consider and approve studies using human/animals before commencement Morphological observation was done periodically When the animals appear inactive as in sleep and breathing Corrected Sentence broke away but now joined together to make meaning Corrected Corrected
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 87: “Thirty albino rats of (51±2.0 g) were...” All units should be separated from their values.	Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Except for a few areas, this manuscript was well written.	