



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	<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>ABSTRACT 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 (P<0.05) should be small and italicized eg: $p<0.05$</p> <p>INTRODUCTION 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>METHODOLOGY The subtopic, "Study Design", should come before line 88. Line 89: Duration (May to October, 2014) of research in</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>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 Line 95: "...feed diet...", wrong English. Delete diet</p> <p>At experimental animals, ethical clearance was not stated Provide the cage size for the experimental animals</p> <p>Line 100: State the voucher or identification number of the plant sample Line 108: Ethanol should start with small letter Line 111: Sentence should be reframed</p> <p>At the experimental animals section, the weight of rats (180-220g) is different from the weights (160-220g) mentioned at experimental design. Inconsistency, rectify!!!</p> <p>Line 117 and 118— sentence should be reframed. 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> <p>RESULTS Line 143: is not necessary, should be deleted. Line 145: I suggest you change the "n=3" to "n=12."</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>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>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.</p> <p>Line 192: Histology of the normal liver (fig. 2), 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 (Fig. 3-6) 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 figures 2-6. For figures 5 and 6, the hepatocytes were showing signs of fatty changes; should be described well.</p> <p>DISCUSSION</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>Very poor discussion. Should discuss his work well with not less than ten (10) references backing and explaining the observed results.</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>The following were absent:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conclusion 2. Acknowledgement 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Please clarify the ethical issue, if any</p> <p>Some how. 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>	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asante Du-Bois
Department, University & Country	Department of Biomedical and Forensic Sciences, University of Cape Coast, Ghana