



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_23196
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Hepatotoxic Effects of Aqueous and Phenolic Extracts of Avocado (Persea americana) Seed in 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>)



[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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I evaluated the manuscript which titled “Comparative Hepatotoxic Effects of Aqueous and Phenolic Extracts of Avocado (<i>Persea americana</i> Seed in Wistar Albino Rats”. Though the study is not interesting from academic point of view, from a clinical perspective, its significance is doubtful. Study is not original. There are a lot of studies about <i>Persea americana</i> and its toxicity. Also some studies showed that the therapeutic effects of <i>Persea americana</i> at dose of 500 mg/kg. Therefore, scientific writing style of manuscript is completely inadequate. Abstract: Place and duration part is unnecessary in abstract. Result is not understandable such as authors emphasized that liver marker enzymes are different than control group. However, this mention is not open if it's higher than control or	Although alot of studies has been carried out on <i>Persea americana's</i> seed, leaves, bark, stem etc, but they are more concerned about its therapeutic effects. However, there is limited data regarding the toxicity potentials at the dose of 500mg/kg. Infact organs toxicity data was limited too. place and duration is part of the journal standard. Results section in abstract was recasted so that it would be more understandable
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	not. Abstract should be clear and understandable. Introduction: All of plants extracts can induce toxicity or hepatotoxicity in animals. Also, toxicity of <i>Persea Americana</i> was studied. What is the difference of your study from others? Importance of your work is insufficient. There are no attractive sentences in your introduction part for specialty of your study. Materials and Methods There is no information about ethic committee report. At the same time, why do you choose the dose 500mg/kg for inducing toxicity? There is no literature for toxicity of this dose in your manuscript. Which statistical packaged was use for analyse the measured parameters? Result and discussion When the some literatures are investigate for compatibility to manuscript, some problem	The different of this study to others is we check on sub-chronic hepatotoxicity of the seed extract. Many toxicity studies were more concern on LD₅₀ and histopathology results are also scanty Ethical considerations was mentioned. Corrections taking care of. Manually by student <i>t-test</i> The incompatibility with supporting literatures was corrected with more relevant ones
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	determined. For example; literature 20 and 21 are not dealing with this study. Maybe you can see the same parameters in these articles but not same application (<i>Persea Americana</i>). So, you can't support your study with these articles. In histopathology figures, there is no symbol for indicate the degenerative areas. References are not compatible with the format of the journal and the each other. Especially, author should control the punctuation.	The symbols was used to indicate the degenerative areas Reference issues corrected.
--	--	---