



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_31490
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECT OF ETHANOL EXTRACT OF RIPE DENETTIA TRIPETALA FRUITS ON INDICES OF LIVER AND KIDNEY FUNCTION IN MALE ALBINO 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	1. Frequency of <i>D. tripetala</i> dosage should be stated. Example daily dose of for 30 days. 2. There were contradictions in p-value interpretations with some wrongly interpreted. Example, in lines 23 to 26 of the abstract. 3. Potassium and alkaline phosphatase should be removed from keywords as they are covered by the words kidney and liver function markers. 4. The 'L. G. A.' in line 64 should be written in full first. In addition, 'gotten' should be replaced with obtained or purchased. 5. There is need to state how fruit samples were authenticated. 6. Replace 'declared' in line 96 with considered. 7. Table 1 caption should be : Concentration of kidney function markers in rats orally administered with <i>D. tripetala</i> fruits 8. Table 1 did not reflect statistical analysis conducted. Example the 'a' . 'b' and 'c' on lines 115 and 116 were not reflected in the table and the abstract only shown p = 0.05. 9. Figure 1 should be re-presented in tabular form. 10. Results not adequately discussed. Parts of discussion are rather results, example is in lines 136, 137, 151 – 153 and 157. 11. Conclusion should reflect study objectives. Ethical Issues: Author(s) did not state whether ethical clearance related to the use of animals in research is obtained or not.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Salisu Maiwada Abubakar
Department, University & Country	Biochemistry Department, Bayero University Kano, Nigeria