



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_31349
Title of the Manuscript:	Toxicity Assessment of Sub Lethal Doses of Chlorpyrifos on the Liver and Kidney Organs of Male Wistar 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	The title of the manuscript should be changed to "Assessment of renal and hepatotoxicity of in rats orally administered with chlorpyrifos" Abstract should be re-written to remove unnecessary details. Last sentence of sub-section 2.1 should be moved to 2.2 Use different line styles for different groups in the figures. Conclusion should reflect major finding on the effects of oral administration of chlorpyrifos on rats. Ethical Issues: The author(s) stated that 'All animals were handled in accordance with the guidelines for care and use of laboratory animals. 116 "All authors hereby declare that "Principles of laboratory animal care" (NIH publication No. 85-117 23, revised 1985) were followed, as well as specific national laws where applicable. All experiments have been examined and approved	- The title of the manuscript can not be changed to the suggested title because the kidney and liver organs captured were the target audience of the study. - Abstract had been re-written and some of the details had been removed - The last sentence of sub-section 2.1 had been moved to 2.2 - Different colors had been used to denote different treatments in the figures. - Conclusion had been re-written to reflect major findings in the study. Ethical Issues: ``The corrected ethical statement is Line 115: `` All animals were handled in accordance with the guidelines for care and use of laboratory animals as stated by the Animal care and use research ethic committee.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	by the appropriate ethics committee". It would be good to name the appropriate ethics committee.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Merge Tables 1 and 2. 2. Figure 2 should be presented as percentage weight gain	1.Tables 1 and 2 and others had been converted to histograms using the parameters of the same units. 2.Figure 2 had been presented as percentage weight gain.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		