



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_30539
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Nephroprotective Activity of Aqueous and Hydroethanolic Extracts of Trema guineensis Leaves (Ulmaceae) Against Gentamicin-Induced Nephrotoxicity in 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Rewrite the abstract. Check for spellings and sentence structure. Restructure lines 40-45 Check the referencing style in the text and correct Line 49 "consists in". Rephrase line 60-61 The introduction needs major revision. Check line 74 "the macerated obtained" Line 83 "the filtrate is" Line 86 "wistar albino rats" Line 116 "euthanized by cervical dislocation" Line 120 "this serum" Line 121 " the collected urines" Please re-write the results again and make it comprehensive. Rephrase lines 219-222 Line 243 replace "would have" with could havemost common urinary abnormalities ? line 24 check and explain the mechanism of the statement in line 262check and correct lines 264-265 plants were a rich..... The conclusion is not solid.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 11 change 'to' to from Rewrite the methodology in the abstract. Check your spellings.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper appears good but howevr there are lot of revisions needed and a clear explanation of the aim and significance of the research. Sound conclusion should be drawn at the end of the paper. I recommend the entire paper to be revised.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mbagwu Smart
Department, University & Country	Department of Anatomy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria