



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_BJMMR_27521</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EFFECTS OF ETHANOLIC EXTRACT OF MONODORA MYRISTICA SEED (AFRICAN NUTMEG) ON SOME LIVER FUNCTION PARAMETERS USING ALBINO WISTAR RATS</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>A lot of work needs to be done before it reaches the level of a publishable manuscript in a reputable journal such as BJMMR.</p> <p>Requires major revision.</p> <p>I have the following comments:</p> <p><b>ABSTRACT</b>  Line 6 (Aim): the word "Investigate" should begin with a small letter.  Line 13: There should full-stop after "clean water".  Line 21, the "P" in (<math>P &lt; 0.05</math>) should be small and italicized eg: <math>p &lt; 0.05</math></p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION</b>  Line 45, the family name "annonaceae" should begin with a capital letter  Line 55 (Spacing): "...oblongoid inshape..." should read "...oblongoid in shape..."  Line 59-60: Reframe sentence. Too much of the conjunction "and"  Line 61: Missing a coma after hemorrhoids  Line 62: Missing full-stop after constipation  Line 72-78: Should be referenced  Line 76: "...Liver markers..." not "...Liver makers..."</p> <p><b>METHODOLOGY</b></p>	<p>We sincerely appreciate your thorough work on our manuscript.  Your comments/observations have been implemented.</p> <p><b>Thanks.</b></p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>The subtopic, "Study Design", should come before line 88.</p> <p>Line 89: Duration (May to October, 2014) of research in the study design section of the Abstract and that of the Methodology section (May to June, 2014) is different. Rectify!!!</p> <p>Line 94: State the room temperature</p> <p>Line 95: "...feed diet...", wrong English. Delete diet</p> <p>At <b>experimental animals</b>, ethical clearance was not stated</p> <p>Provide the cage size for the experimental animals</p> <p>Line 100: State the voucher or identification number of the plant sample</p> <p>Line 108: Ethanol should start with small letter</p> <p>Line 111: Sentence should be reframed</p> <p>At the <b>experimental animals</b> section, the weight of rats (180-220g) is different from the weights (160-220g) mentioned at <b>experimental design</b>. Inconsistency, rectify!!!</p> <p>Line 117 and 118— sentence should be reframed.</p> <p>Line 121: Should be "tudes" not bottles</p> <p>Line 133: (Wrong citation) ....Ekeanyanwu and Njoku (2014), were not the first individuals to introduce the histopathology method. It is a well known method and attributing it to a wrong person is not acceptable. You can site Bancroft and Gamble (2008); and give a brief explanation of the process.</p> <p>Line 138: reframe the sentence. What 5% level???</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p><b>RESULTS</b></p> <p>Line 143: is not necessary, should be deleted.</p> <p>Line 145: I suggest you change the “n=3” to “n=12.” Though you were sacrificing three (3) at a time for analysis, you began the work with 12 animals in each group.</p> <p>Line 144 (Table 1), the difference between the control and treated group (200mg/kg) were high enough to evoke statistical significance for the individual weeks. Should re-check.</p> <p><b>NB: Should give subtopics for the description of the tables (1-5). Very important, so that one can easily make out the explanation of the tables at a glance.</b></p> <p>Line 192: Histology of the normal liver (<b>fig. 2</b>), is not acceptable. This is because it is at X40 magnification (and I can hardly see the hepatocytes) whiles the photomicrographs of the treated groups (<b>Fig. 3-6</b>) are at X100. For consistency and also appreciation of the hepatocytes from the normal liver, X100 photomicrograph is better.</p> <p>Also, the magnification and the histological stain type should be provided in the legends below <b>figures 2-6</b>. For <b>figures 5 and 6</b>, the hepatocytes were showing signs of fatty changes; should be described well.</p> <p><b>DISCUSSION</b></p> <p>Line 220: Ekeanyanwu and Njoku (2014), should be deleted, since numbers are being used for in-text references.</p> <p>Line 237: “...dependent manner...” not “...depended manner...”</p> <p><b>Very poor discussion.</b> Should discuss his work well</p>	
--	---	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>with not less than ten (10) references backing and explaining the observed results.</p> <p><b>The following were absent:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conclusion</li> <li>2. Acknowledgement</li> </ol>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Please clarify the ethical issue, if any</p> <p>Somehow. Similar work has been done by Onyenibe et al., (2015), but with different title "African Nutmeg (<i>Monodora Myristica</i>) Lowers Cholesterol and Modulates Lipid Peroxidation in Experimentally Induced Hypercholesterolemic Male Wistar Rats".</p> <p>Thus this work must take a different line (novelty) from what is known. The histopathology and liver function test should be well expatiated.</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>This is an interesting topic, but the discussion of the specific objective (physiology of the liver) will tell it all.</p> <p>This article has many defects that need to be amended.</p> <p>Overall satisfactory</p>	