



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_43527
Title of the Manuscript:	ELECTROLYTE CONCENTRATIONS IN APPARENTLY HEALTHY INDIVIDUALS AFTER CONSUMPTION OF AQUEOUS EXTRACT OF JATROPHA TANJORENSIS
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>)

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	<p>ethical issues:</p> <p>Authors should submit ethical committee approval number.</p> <p>Authors should explain mechanism of ionic imbalance during 7th and 14th day of treatment.</p> <p>Why authors restricted in specific age and weight?</p> <p>P values are not match with in abstract and result table.</p> <p>Authors should explain extract procedure of plant material</p> <p>Authors should give references of formula which is mention in extract of plant material.</p> <p>Authors should give version of graph pad prism.</p> <p>Authors restricted only 7 healthy voluntary. Why? Any refence....</p>	<p>Ethical Approval has been obtained and attached in the mail.</p> <p>The mechanism of ionic imbalance has further been explained.</p> <p>These were those that wilfully accepted to participate. In scientific measurements, vital components of the research are always stated, Thus their weight and age range reported.</p> <p>Ok. The p values on the table only indicated where the significance was obtained. Those situations where the p values on the table are less than 0.05 are significant while those above 0.05 are not significant have been corrected.</p> <p>Ok. The procedure of extraction stated.</p> <p>Ok. The formula has been given in the text</p> <p>Ok.</p> <p>The study was conducted in a school environment. The essence of using only healthy individuals is basically to determine the effect of the plant on electrolyte function on healthy individuals. Note that plant extract is not only for the sick, it is believed to be an immune booster and as such taken by healthy individuals as well.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	