



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_26031
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth Factor Receptors and Liver Injury
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. It is absurd to have " the cytoplasm was shown to be the main site for FGFR3 expression" 2. Introduction is very fragmented within and between paragraphs. Some sentences are very hard to understand. 3. The methods are not adequately described. For example, single dose and 6 week CCL4 were given at front end or back end? 4. Results are not well organized and properly presented. 5. The histimmunofluorescence pictures look very suspicious. 6. Discussion does not have any depth instead it is just a laundry list. 7. The language is very deficient Ethical issue: Yes. The animal study was not reviewed and approved by Animal Care and Usage Committee.	1. FGFR3 expression wasn't nuclear. if it was nuclear it won't appear with DAPI. if it was membranous it will appear as a thin line surrounding the cell.it appeared as a large spot that make the cytoplasmic expression is the most likely to be right. This agree with Lee et al. "reference 44" that reported the cytoplasmic expression of FGFRs. 2. Introduction,method,results , discussion and language have been revised 3. Ethics committee approval have not been get yet. Once I get it I will send it.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. "The liver plays an unlimited role in...." 2. " showed pathological findings changes according to the duration of treatment " 3. "The aim of this study is to explore the expression pattern of " explore?? 4. "Concomitant CCL4 for 11 weeks has showed significant elevation in ALP activity..." These are just a few examples.	These errors have been corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is not a solid study. The design obviously did not fully consider all the information published. The quality of the writing is quite poor as well.	