



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_26075
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Investigation of the Effects of the Commonly-consumed Aqueous Extracts of Hibiscus sabdariffa (Zobo Drinks) on Some Biochemical and Renal Indices using Normal Wistar Albino Rats
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	Abstract: They should not conclude the samples have hepatoprctective effect, because they don't have any enough data for this. The purpose of this study was to explore any of toxic effect. The authors should conclude there is no toxic effect on hepar and renal. P 2, I 80, The writing of volume unit in cl should be change in mL P3, I 110-123, There is two different terminology in preparation blood samples: plasma and serum (plasma was used in AST and ALT preparation, but serum was used in renal indices). Did the authors used the different method for preparation samples? If they used the same method, the terminology must also the same. Result and discussion (p 3, I 139- p4, I 157, and p5 177-192 The authors should not duplicate the writing value in sentences, because they has been presented in the table. They should compare and discussed with primary data from other journals. P5, I 170-171, The authors should not present the hepatoprotective effect because this study was designed to explore the toxicity not the hepatoprotective effect. Conclusion I 215, The conclusion is too long, it contain not only conclusion but also data, suggestion and recommendation. The authors should reparaphrase into the appropriate one. Overall, The authors should added the discussion, they can refer some primary journals.	Abstract: Noted and done P2, I 180 – changed P3, I 110 – 123 – corrected Results and Discussion: The duplicated values have been removed. Other corrections have been effected. Conclusion: The conclusion has been abridged a bit. However, it contains suggestion and recommendation because there were no sections for such from the journal template, so, the authors decided to merge the suggestions and recommendations in the conclusion section.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

--	--	--