



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_28379
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Impact of Rifampicin on some Hepatic Parameters of Albino Wistar Rats
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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	There are some comments on this article: <u>Introduction:</u> At line-28, "sundrome" should be corrected to "syndrome". At line-29, "intermittent schedule, hypersensitivity" should be corrected to "intermittent schedule. Hypersensitivity". At lines-29,30, "Hypersensitivity reactions have been noted, rash, prutitus, urtacaria, pemphigoid reaction and flushing have also been noted" should be corrected to "Hypersensitivity reactions, rash, prutitus, urtacaria, pemphigoid reaction and flushing have been noted". At line-31, "antcoagulant" should be corrected to "anticoagulant". At line-32, "ot has been recommended that" should be corrected to "it has been recommended that". -The aim of the work should be mentioned at the end of the introduction section.	Sundrome has been corrected to syndrome Corrections done in line 29 Line 29-30 effectively corrected Antcoagulant corrected to anticoagulant Line 32 effectively corrected Aim of the work has been inserted at the end of introduction Three marker enzymes corrected to two as required Phosphate has been corrected to phosphatase This has been done has directed and a new



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<u>Methodology:</u> At line-48, "three marker enzymes" should be corrected to "two marker enzymes". At line-49, "phosphate" should be corrected to "phosphatase" (i.e. alkaline phosphatase). -The way of data presentation and statistical analysis and the software package used for this analysis as well as the level of significance of the difference among various groups should be mentioned under a subheading of "Statistical analysis". <u>Results:</u> -In Table 1, what is the meaning of NL, i.e. the unit of ALT activity? At line-66, "a slight significant difference" should be corrected to "a slight insignificant difference". At line-67, "a slight significant difference" should be corrected to "a slight insignificant difference". <u>Discussion:</u> At line-73, "The present results shows" should be corrected to "The present results show". At line-76, "This observation is an agreement with" should be corrected to "This observation is in agreement with".	subheading entitled statistical analysis has been created It is rather μI. It has been corrected to μI. The statement is effectively corrected. The statement is effectively corrected. The statement is corrected has indicated by the reviewer. The statement has been corrected effectively. The statement has been corrected The space have been shifted to normal This correction has been done This correction has been effected All references are now corrected to the
--	---	---

	At line-78, "ALT and ALP elevated activities is more specific" should be corrected to "ALT and ALP elevated activities are more specific". -At the end of line-80, there is an unnecessary space, which needs to be corrected. At line-82, "¹² in their Journal of Applied Toxicology, Vol. 16, 375-380 reported an increased levels of ALP" should be corrected to "Another study ¹² reported increased levels of ALP". At line-84, "a decreased in the total protein" should be corrected to "a decrease in the total protein". <u>References:</u> -All references must be written in the style and format of the journal as the following: 1. Anne M, Sharon E, Michael H. Evaluation of Riflabazil in a combination treatment regimen as an alternative to isoniazid rifampicin therapy in a mouse tuberculosis model. Antimicrob Agents Chemotherapy. 2000; 44: 3167-3168. 2. Lancini G, Zanicelli W. In structure activity relationship among the semisynthetic antibiotics. D. Perlman (ed). Academic Press, New York, 1997; pp. 531-600. At line-95, the pages numbers of ref-1 should be mentioned. At line-100, the pages numbers of ref-3 should be	original style and format of the journal. Pages no inserted Pages no not found Names of editors not found
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	mentioned. At line-106, the pages numbers of ref-5 should be mentioned. At line-113, the names of editors and the publishing company and its city of ref-7 should be mentioned. At line-114, the title of ref-8 should be mentioned and "Tsankov 2003. Tsankov N and Angelova I" should be corrected to "Tsankov N, Angelova I.". At line-116, "Veena, Somanatha Bhat" should be corrected to "Veena SB.". At line-118, the pages numbers of ref-9 should be mentioned. At line-121, the volume, part and pages numbers of ref-10 should be mentioned. At line-126, the title of ref-12 should be mentioned and "Vol. 16(5): 375-380" should be corrected to "1996; 16(5): 375-380.". At line-130, "Vol.4, No.2, pp. 117-121" should be corrected to "2004; 4(2): 117-121.". At line-133, the edition number should be mentioned. The ethical committee according to which the study was approved or the organization according to which the principles of laboratory animal facilities were adopted should be mentioned.	This correction have been effected
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	No	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No	