



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	Title Suggestion: Comparative Study of the commonly-consumed aqueous extracts of <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> (Zobo Drinks) on hepatic and renal indices using normal Wistar albino rats Abstract Results: Kindly specify the results (number) in the range. Lower and higher is not that significant. Introduction: Paragraph 1: Please specify the uses of fleshy red calyces as it popular. Paragraph 2: Non-anthocyanin portions are isolated from? Please specify Last paragraph: Instead of elucidating.....suggested to write evaluating Materials and Methods Please add's' to material.....subheading like the yellow highlighted. Please mention the year of getting the dried calyces. Table 1 uses abbreviation under group: A (cntrl), B (ZSTD).....could you please write the full name at the footnote or section 2.5. Section 2.6 and 2.7: Kindly specify how much of your samples used in each assay. Your explanation is too general and stated follow the author or kit. It is better to specify how you conduct instead of general statement. Results and Discussion: Ok Conclusion: Ok References : Ok	Title: The title has been modified in lieu with the suggestion. Abstract: Due to the limit to the number of words (300) to be used in the abstract, we decided to make the abstract very candid and succinct. This is why P-values were used to state the significant differences in the results obtained in the study. Specifying the numbers of all the result will increase the number of words in the abstract very much. P-values were used in the abstract to summarize the results, while the values of the results were fully specified in the 'Results and Discussion' section. Introduction: The paragraphs have been modified. Materials and Methods: All issues raised have been addressed. The full names of the abbreviations in the tables have been stated at the footnote section. Section 2.6 and 2.7: The procedures used were as outlined in the reference materials. The specific methods used for each parameter will be too lengthy if added to the sections.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The article is good. Maybe can consider to follow up with other tests.	