



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Introduction is very fragmented within and between paragraphs. Some sentences are very hard to understand. 2. The methods are not adequately described. 3. Results are not well organized and properly presented. 4. Discussion does not have any depth instead is just a rundown list. 5. Most of this study had been presented in Reference #33 6. It is ludicrous to claim " our findings indicate, for the first time, that TGFβR1 is upregulated in chronic liver injury." as it is well documented that TGFβ is the main signal of fibrosis. 7. The language is very deficient	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. HSC is not defined 2. "... On contrast, Six weeks CCL4 treatment..." 3. "The liver plays an unlimited role in the preservation and body homeostasis regulation." 4. " They mediate HSC activation (3) after binding to their ligand cytokine TGFβ, ..." These are just a few examples. Ethical issue: The animal study was not reviewed and approved by Animal Care and Usage Committee	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<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.	
---	---	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	China Three Gorges University, China