



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_26076
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Investigation of the Effects of the Commonly-consumed Aqueous Extracts of Hibiscus sabdariffa (Zobo Drinks) on Haematological Parameters using Normal Wistar Albino 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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript is well-written. The findings were found to be interesting and well-justified. However, a few facts to be improved:</p> <p>a). title need to be more specific (need to mention about the different concentration of zobo drink)</p> <p>b). justify the use of albino wistar rats (in terms of species, male/female, weight of the animals).</p> <p>c). specify on which preparation of zobo drink showed beneficial effects on blood parameters and explain.</p> <p>d). Lowering WBC count was not well justified.</p> <p>e). what are the possible active compounds that</p>	<p>a. Only one concentration was used (200 mg/kg) with different drink samples. However, the title has been modified to reflect the concentration used.</p> <p>b. Wistar albino rats were used because their genetic, biological and behaviour characteristics closely resemble those of humans, and many symptoms of human conditions can be replicated using wistar albino rats. Using animals of the same species ensures uniformity. Also, during grouping,</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>provide the beneficial haematological parameters. f). justify the use of aqueous extract.</p>	<p>animals of the same sex were separated in order to prevent breeding during the period of the study. Furthermore, animals were grouped according to their weights in such a way to minimize the differences in weight between them and obtain near uniformity in the mean weight of a particular group in order to eliminate bias.</p> <p>c. Done d. Done e. This is suggested for further research f. Aqueous extract was used because the drinks are prepared and consumed as an aqueous extract.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>All the results were well written, however, the explanation for each result went missing.</p> <p>Discussion section is needed to re-write.</p>	The results that were not discussed are those parameters that were not significantly affected in this study.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is well-written. The findings provided are compromising.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	