



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_25588
Title of the Manuscript:	Ethanol extract of Acalypha wilkesiana leaves ameliorates paracetamol-induced hepatotoxicity in 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	1. There are major typographical, grammatical and spacing errors that need to be addressed i.e., Line no: 17-18; 24; 47; 67; 137; 200-203. 2. The references are poorly done (non-uniform). 3. Line no 81-82; 99 are contradictory statement on how the quantitative data will be presented after analyses. 4. The experimental data is supposed to be collected on weekly bases and the timeline for the experiment not stated and the results not presented in the table line no: 98, which is also wrongly labelled. 5. Either or both the magnification and linear bar of the Histopathological plates should be indicated. In addition the normal control plate should be presented or comparison and the stain used at the method section should be stated. 6. The discussion section is lacking, because the Flavonoids are the major constituents of the plant extract are not discussed as antioxidants in the study and any supporting literature/ similar studies is furthermore required to support this section.	The corrections were noted and effected. Thank you for your comments. The timeline for the experiment was stated. The experiment lasted for 21 days (3weeks). The results has been properly presented The stain used for the histology was stated at the section titled 'Histopathological study on the liver'.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. At the study title put the Authority of the plant i.e. "<i>Acalypha Wilkesiana</i>. Muell". And delete the full stop sign".!" 2. The plant name <i>Acalypha Wilkesiana</i> in the rest of the writing can be shortened as <i>A. Acalypha</i>. 3. Also the study title can be presented in sentence case to look more appealing and compelling. 4. Line no 12-13; do all the phytochemical have antioxidant activity? The statement is too generalised. 5. Line no 24: Most blood samples for chemistry test are collect on non-heparinised tubes, is the statement correct? 6. Line no 89: Table 1.1, does not have legends to express the status of the results. 7. Line no 25: The word "leave" should be pluralised. Ethical issue: The author's need to state the body that approved the study and in any case the ethical review number.	The corrections were noted and effected. Thank you for your comments. More light has been thrown into that statement. The statement is correct. I simply indicated that the samples were collected in heparine bottles. There are other anticoagulants used for chemistry ananalysis. But for this research what was used is heparine anticoagulant bottles.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The search for alternative natural antioxidants is on rise and such kind of these studies is necessary and timely. However, the present study required major revision before being accepted for publication in this journal.	