



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_27521
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF ETHANOLIC EXTRACT OF MONODORA MYRISTICA SEED (AFRICAN NUTMEG) ON SOME LIVER FUNCTION PARAMETERS USING ALBINO 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 <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	<p>The author(s) should recast the aim to reflect the study subject (Wistar rats), which is not on humans subjects who consume <i>MONODORA MYRISTICA</i> SEED.</p> <p>The present topic does not reflect properly, the study and should be revised thus: 'HISTOMORPHOLOGICAL AND BIOCEMICAL EFFECTS OF ETHANOLIC EXTRACT OF MONODORA MYRISTICA SEED (AFRICAN NUTMEG) ON SOME LIVER FUNCTION PARAMETERS USING ALBINO WISTAR RATS.</p> <p>The authors should state the Herbarium number of the plant material.</p> <p>The authors should state the percentage of formalin used for 'fixing' the liver samples and the duration of fixation.</p> <p>Though the authors reported that Mindray 129 Auto-analyzer machine (Model: BS – 800M) was used to assay the total AST, ALT, ALP, protein and albumin activities, they did not state the method of assay. This should be stated for reproducibility of a work of this nature.</p> <p>The P values should be included in tables 1-5. The figures should be presented with magnification and staining technique for each, stated. Varied magnifications were used for control and for the</p>	<p>We agree with your view on the topic of our manuscript and have effected it. Other issues raised which include the plant herbarium number, percentage of formalin and duration of fixation, ethical approval, varied magnification of slides, etc have been effected.</p> <p>Thanks.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	different test slides. This does not permit objective histological examination. The authors should present figures with the same magnification for better review of their finding which looks ambiguous and not agreeable.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Ethical issue: A study of this nature needs ethical approval. There is no indication that it was neither sought nor obtained.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript should be revised for some technical errors.	