



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_25356
Title of the Manuscript:	CHELATION POTENTIAL OF AQUEOUS LEAF EXTRACTS OF VERNONIA AMYGDALINA AND PHYLLANTHUS AMARUS ON KIDNEY FUNCTIONS IN LEAD-INTOXICATED 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	ABSTRACT The abstract is not very clearly outlined, the different treatment groups were not clearly outlined. Also, needs to be revisit for correct grammatical construction. INTRODUCTION -Line 47.... 163 people between March and June 2010. You need to cite the reference. -Line 53 Account of two pathways which..... operate simultaneously. -Rephrase lines 56 and 57 - Can you please mention the English and or local names of these plants? - Rephrase lines 89 and 90 MATERIALS AND METHODS 2.1 Plant Material - You didn't write the Voucher numbers of the plants as obtained from the Herbarium which is very important. 2.2 Preparation of the aqueous extract - The plant can never be evaporated to dryness by heating in a water bath only. Can you mention any further treatment given to the extract? -What are the percentage yields of the two extracts? 2.4 Laboratory Animals - You only mentioned that they were purchased from the animal breeding unit. Where? - A period of at least two weeks is required for	The different treatment groups have been clearly outlined. Abstract has been grammatically edited. Reference cited. Correction of the word to 'operate' made. Line rephrased. English name: Bitter leaf, local name: onugbu (in igbo). Lines rephrased. The voucher numbers were not retrieved for publishing as is the policy to avoid falsification. This was ascertained by my team which were more involved at this stage of the project. The extracts were further dried in a Gallenkamp oven at 80°C until constant weights were obtained. Percentage yields were 18.60% and 10.33% of VA and PA respectively. Breeding unit mentioned.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	acclimatization of the experimental animals to the environment but not only a week. 2.5 Induction of Lead intoxication -How can you account for the amount of lead taken by each experimental animal in the intoxicated groups? Or did you follow an established protocol? You then need to cite the reference. Experimental design -Lines 124-128 you should use only mg/kg to indicate concentration but not mg/kg b.w -RESULTS AND DISCUSSION - In your results for all the tables there is the need to also compare all the intoxicated groups to the normal control as well - Also the level of significance for the statistical analysis is indicated by $P = .05$ but not $P < 0.05$ DISCUSSION -Lines 241-244 you need to explain based on your results and existing literatures why the kidney failed to excrete the urea and creatinine in the lead intoxicated control group. - Line 247 allergic reactions(10). - Lines 265-267 you need to explain from the results of the histopathological evaluation why you think the treatments brought possible reversal of kidney damage in the experimental animals.	Correction has been made. An established protocol was followed. Reference cited. Corrections made. Comparison to the normal control has been included. Level of significance is $P = 0.05$ BUT, by convention a small p-value is always taken as an alpha below 5%. Thus when the $p < 0.05$ which we is considered as small, it automatically leads to a rejection of the Null hypothesis. It further leads to the conclusion that the data available is not consistent with the null hypothesis hence the difference or effect or association that has been observed could not be attributed to sampling error and therefore it is said to be statistically significant. Reason for kidney dysfunction now given and reference cited. Correction of the word to 'allergy' made. Histopathological evaluation outcome given.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	CONCLUSION -Your conclusion is in the form of a phrase, can you make it a sentence so that it can make more sense and at the same time capture your major findings? -You need to mention the contribution of each author in the research work in the Authors Contributions Section	It is a compound sentence that captures major findings. That has been done. Thankyou Reviewer. All your commentsare appreciated.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		