



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_28385
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF ANTI-INFLAMMATORY ACTIVITIES OF ERYTHROCOCCA ANOMALA AQUEOUS AND ETHANOLIC LEAVES EXTRACTS IN RAT.
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	The authors employed only the carrageenan induced paw edema model in rats. However, the anti-inflammatory properties of aqueous and ethanolic extracts from <i>Erythrococca anomala</i> leaves could also be evaluated by additional in vitro and in vivo assays. Among these assays are the measurement of TNF production in LPS-stimulated Balb/c mice, the ability of extracts to inhibit the expression of pro-inflammatory cytokines either in the cell lysates from LPS-treated murine macrophages or in supernatant, the evaluation of serum TNF or the inhibitor of IKK β activity assay as well as the COX inhibition assay.	We are agreed for your suggestions. The aim of our experience is to compare the anti-inflammatory activity of the different aqueous and ethanolic extracts of the leaves of <i>Erythrococca anomala</i> on the edema and the concentration of the CRP inhibited by the carrageenan. So we will do these experiences in the future.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Bad English usage. Certain phrases should be rewritten. For instance, in the section "1. INTRODUCTION" "So, there is a need to continue to research newer anti-inflammatory drugs" should be replaced by "Conceivably, more research is needed to identify new anti-inflammatory drugs" (lines 34-35). The phrase "...research strategy in the search for.." (line 39) is also wrong while in line 41 "for" is repeated twice.	Dear reviewers we were agreed about your suggestions. So we have done the corrections concerning the manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-	