



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	Why both sexes of animals were used? There are differences between sexes in nephrotoxicity. How were the groups formed? Were animals of only one sex were included in one group? How were animals kept during experiment? There is no positive control in experiment? With only plant extracts? Why the authors use SEM instead of SD? It is not the same. I would suggest usage of SD. It is not correct to say statistically identical.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The language is not perfect, I would suggest prof reading and language polishing.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Pavle Randjelovic</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Dept. of physiology, University of Nis, Serbia</i>