



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_39569
Title of the Manuscript:	Ameliorative properties of the chloroform stem bark extract of Abrus precatorius against gentamicin-induced renal damage 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>)

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	Present aimed to assess the effect of Abrus Ptrcatorius on gentamicin induced renal impairment. Please see below the comments: Introduction is weak, provides few information and do not present a background for hypotheses and methods. A clear aim is also missing. Methods should be better described. Citations may be kept, but it is important to provide minimal description for every technique. For example, ethno pharmacological and photochemical aspects of the plant must be inserted. Results section is poorly written and summarized. It should be better drafted and described, with appropriate refer to each graph/table. Tables with unnecessary/negative results can be excluded (for example, tables showing haematological outcomes). Is the plant toxic? An experimental group receiving only the plant would show the way. Chemical characterization (fingerprint) should be presented or referred with details (it may contribute to a better discussion). Discussion section should be strengthened. It does not bring any explanation on mechanistic pathways involved in the effects. Furthermore, it does not provide previous information on the use of the plant and similar compounds.	A brief description of the assay methods has been added A clear aim has been added Appropriate references to the results has been added Negative result has been removed
Minor REVISION comments	Manuscript deserves better formatting on structure and language.	
Optional/General comments	NA	