



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> 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>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	provide the beneficial haematological parameters. f). justify the use of aqueous extract.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	All the results were well written, however, the explanation for each result went missing. Discussion section is needed to re-write.	
<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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zar Chi Thent
Department, University & Country	Faculty of Medicine, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia