



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_25627
Title of the Manuscript:	Sulphasalazine Prevents Fibrosis; Relevance of TGFβRI
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	The article describes the protective effects of Sulphasalazine on liver fibrosis via TGFβRI signaling pathway. The authors showed that Sulphasalazine decreased the TGFβRI expression, suggesting that this drug may be used as a target therapy of chronic liver disease. While the study might be of interest major revisions have been clarified. 1) Review the all manuscript punctuation errors and technical writing (example: tetrachloride; pag 1, line 20). 2) In "Methodology" Why dosages of drugs sulphasalazine (75 mg) and mesalazine (100 mg) were different? What is the standard of comparison? 3) How the blood samples were collected? Cardiac puncture? Add in the text. 4) All animals procedures were used the international guide for care and use of laboratory animals, but you have the approval of the ethics committee? Add number in the manuscript. 5) In "Results" you detail about percentage analysis, but do not have these results in the table. I suggest adding in the table.	1. Punctuation has been revised 2. The dosage was determined according to (ED₅₀) that has been described in previous papers - o Because of different administration route and structure of both drugs and hence led to different in bioavailability, we preferred to depend on ED₅₀ only. 3. Samples were collected from ocular vein. It has been added in methodology section 4. Animal procedures have been achieved according to guidelines of international guide for care and use of laboratory animals but written approval hasn't been provided.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		5. Table of percentage change has been added in result section.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) Standardize CCl₄. 2) In “methodology” it would be interesting to add the age of the animals. Ethical issue: lack the approval of the committee of ethics for the use of animals.	1. CCl₄ formula has been corrected 2. Age of animals has been added
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		