



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_35055
Title of the Manuscript:	Ethanol Extract of Solanum melongena Linn Fruit Mitigated Monosodium Glutamate-Induced Oxidative Stress
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 place and duration of study written in abstract must be deleted as it is not the suitable place for writing the place of study and the duration of study is already written in methodology. The voucher specimen number is lacked from Plant materials and preparations. The result and discussion section contains many scientific mistakes: The significant sign * shouldn't be placed on control group in table (3) and the authors didn't mention that the significant difference ($P < 0.05$) is in comparison to control group only in legends under table (3). Moreover, they referred to serum antioxidant parameters while they used liver tissue homogenates. Many author's names are missed. The authors stated that <i>S. melongena</i> Linn fruit could be toxic and should be treated with caution due to the presence of high level of cyanogenic glycosides while in introduction they referred to their uses as vegetables and in traditional medicine so, the authors must explain their point of view to be clear to the readers. References number 28, 43 lacked the last page. The manuscript must be revised carefully.	This was done in line with the Journal guideline. However, I strongly agree with you on it and I just did as recommended. The voucher specimen number was lacked as there was no active herbarium in place as at the time of identification of the plant sample. Thank you for your comment on that. the comparison to the control group has been included. The use of serum antioxidant has been corrected. Liver homogenate was used for the analysis and it has been corrected. Thank you. This suggests that <i>S. melongena</i> Linn fruit could be toxic if consumed in high concentration as a potent poison and should be treated with caution (43). Reference 43 is found in line 201 and 202. Reference 28 is found in line 130.
Minor REVISION comments	There are many repeated words in results and discussion that must be deleted.	Noted and has been corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The abstract is too long and should be summarized. Furthermore, it is necessary to improve English language in the manuscript as there are many spelling and grammatical mistakes.	Noted and has been corrected.