



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_34274
Title of the Manuscript:	RAT SERUM LIVER AND KIDNEY PROFILE FOLLOWING SPHENOSTYLIS STENOCARPA SEED AQUEOUS EXTRACT ADMINISTRATION
Type of the 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	NIL	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Typos: The authors should try to use appropriate gaps to separate the words that were erroneously joined together. E.g., line 4 <i>stenocarpa</i>)is Line 6: <i>sphenostylisstenocarpa</i> Line 7functionsof Line 9: <i>sphenostylisstenocarpa</i> Line 117: <i>Sphenostylisstenocarpa</i> Line 232: <i>Sphenostylisstenocarpa</i> Line 294: arenot 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS: The authors did not indicate that a voucher specimen of the plant material was deposited at the site of identification. It is important to deposit specimen and get the voucher number. Lines 233-236: Although there have 234 been claims from individuals practising alternative medicine on the potential benefits of the 235 aqueous extracts of this plant. There is no documented scientific evidence to support this 1. 236 very claim. The first sentence is not a complete statement. It can be joined to the second sentence to form a single sentence. It could go like this: Although there have	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	234 been claims from individuals practising alternative medicine on the potential benefits of the 235 aqueous extracts of this plant, there is no documented scientific evidence to support this 236 very claim. Or, it could go like this: There have 234 been claims from individuals practising alternative medicine on the potential benefits of the 235 aqueous extracts of this plant. However, there is no documented scientific evidence to support this 236 very claim.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors may consider adding pictures of the plant materials (stem, seeds, tubers) to the document.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Morebise, Olugbenga</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Biochemistry Department, All Saints University School of Medicine, West Indies</i>