



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 (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	Ethical issue: The project permission Ethic No. is not stated, although it is mentioned that the animal experiment complies with the NIH guidelines.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Title: Suggest to change to THE POTENTIAL DETRIMENTAL EFFECTS OF ETHANOLIC EXTRACT OF MONODORA MYRISTICA SEED (AFRICAN NUTMEG) ON THE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION OF ALBINO WISTAR RAT LIVER.</p> <p>Abstract: Needs to be revised carefully.</p> <p>Aim: Line 6 - The study to investigate on the normal morphology and function of the livers of Albino Wistar rats. (not consumers...)</p> <p>Line 9 - Study design: Provide project permission Ethic number.</p> <p>Methodology: Line 16 – each group were sacrificed, blood samples were collected</p> <p>Line 18&19 – The liver of animals were also examined for histological study.</p> <p>Line 23 – The histological study of the liver showed hepatocytes</p> <p>Introduction: Line 82 – Hence, the objective of the study is to investigate ...</p> <p>Method: Line 94 – room temperature (state the temperature in °C)</p> <p>Line 105 – quote the reference (9) in the text as Feyisayo and Oluokum (2013).</p> <p>Line 113 - There is inconsistency in the weight range of the animals; is the weight range 180-220g (Line 11 & Line 91) or 160-220g (Line 113)?</p> <p>Results: Table 1-5: The presentation of the data in table form is a matter of preference. I personally prefer to have the data presented in graphs, which are clearer at a</p>	<p>We sincerely appreciate your view on the title, but the suggestion of one of the other reviewer is preferable as it highlights the scope of our investigations (histomorphological and biochemical).</p> <p>Other issues raised which include ethical approval, typos, inconsistencies in weight of animals and duration of the study, grammatical errors, varied magnification of slides, etc have been effected.</p> <p>Thanks.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>glance. And, when quoting the <u>table</u> 1/2/... has to be written as Table 1/2/... (Lines 147, 153, 158, 174, 230, 233, 235).</p> <p>Line 176 – complete the sentence</p> <p>Line 192 – 212 - Figures: several comments here:</p> <p>To compare microscopic images,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The photomicrographs can be arranged in a plate, labelled as Fig. 2 with the photomicrographs labelled as A, B, C, D and E respectively. 2. The magnification of the images must be the same and with magnification bar included on each photomicrograph, This is to enable a fair comparison. 3. Authors need to describe the histological findings in the control first in order to describe and compare for the changes in the experimental animals. The details of the hepatocytes in Fig. 2 cannot be appreciated. 4. Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Have 2 sets of photomicrographs for each group. Having a low and high magnifications of each group will help solve this problem. (ii) The legend can be compressed such as <p>[Fig. 2: Photomicrographs of liver of the various groups. A. Normal control group - showing , B. treated with 200mg/kg M. myristica for one week - showing ..., C. treated with 400mg/kg M. myristica for one week - showing ..., D. treated with 200mg/kg M. myristica for four weeks - showing ..., E. treated with 400mg/kg M. myristica for four weeks - showing</p> <p>Note: The font type and size of the Legend has to be uniform.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Authors need to discuss the effects of drugs/ chemicals on the structure and function of the liver, and the scientific findings reported to date with respect to M. myristica since this plant is widely used in various part of the globe.</p> <p>Line 219 & 222 – omit the word 'etc.'</p> <p>Line 220 – Add an open bracket ...(2014)</p> <p>Line 230 – 238 – authors need to discuss the biochemical findings and relate the findings with the disruption of liver morphology and function.</p> <p>Line 233 – Any explanation why the SEM value of AST level in the 400mg/kg for 1 week is high?</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Line 239 - ...disruptive effects on the morphology and function of the liver.</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The manuscript has to be read by English speaking person to ensure clarity of the whole text. Several typos are detected.2. The morphological finding is a qualitative findings; it is good if this finding can be quantified by using immunohistochemistry and analysis of the degree of tissue damage from the liver tissue homogenate.	
---	---	--