



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_41307
Title of the Manuscript:	Sub-acute Toxicity Study of Aqueous Leaves Extract of Jatropha Gossypifilia in Albino Rats: Serum Biochemistry and Histopathological Evaluation
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	- The title can be reformulated as follow: Toxicity Study of Aqueous Leaves Extract of Jatropha Gossypifilia Autor initial (Family) from Nigeria in Albino Rats - The Abstract can be restructured according to the Journal guideline. Add mean values of biomarkers (control vs test) - Despite the fact that the aqueous extract of this plant species is toxic comparing to the previous studies, the authors have not explain the possible reasons of this contradiction notably the influence of the environmental and climatic factors on the quality and the quantity of secondary metabolites. - To assess sub-acute toxicity test, it is recommend treating animals with the repeated dose of 1/10 of DL50 (50.3 mg/kg). It is thus normal that, in your experimental conditions (250 mg/kg) which is four time greater, toxicity occurred. Your DL50 revealed that the plant species is moderately toxic. Please reconsider your interpretation section if possible and quote by a reference.	- Recommendation reconsidered - Mean for the biomarkers included in the abstract - Reasons for the differences observed in this study compared to the cited example included. - Recommendation are appropriately considered
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		