



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJPR_20067
Title of the Manuscript:	Cytoprotective and Antioxidant Properties of the Stem Bark Aqueous extract of khaya grandifoliola (Meliaceae) in Rats
Type of the Article	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>)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	The abstract indicates duration of the study without any data. Section 2.3 (phytochemical tests) does not include any reference for the tests. There is no coincidence between the inhibition values on line 239 and those of table 5 for <i>K grandifoliola</i> . It is the same case for gastric content volume in control rats on lines 242 & 243 vs values of table 6. Lines 273 & 274: it is adequate to write enzyme activity for SOD and catalase; in the case of G-SH, that is not an enzyme, the term concentration can be used. Line 296: I suggest to eliminate: are then tested.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juan C Diaz Zagoya
Department, University & Country	National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico