



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_42671
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of Chrysanthelium indicum aqueous extract on Biochemical and Haematological parameters in Albino rats.
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	This is a very impactful work, however, I suggest that the following should be noted 1. From the content of the work, I am suggesting that the topic should be reframed to reflect toxicity study because haematology and biochemical parameters are reflecting the investigation of whether or not the plant is toxic. 2. The sentence that began from line 84 to 86 should be properly written. The grammar is faulty 3. The sub-topics under materials and methods should be written on a separate line to reflect the journals guide line. 4. In line 66, what is the justification of using only male rats, is the tea consumed by only male folks? 5. What is the justification for using three rats for acute toxicity and five rats for sub-acute toxicity? 6. Ethical issues on animal usage was not mentioned, what procedure(s) was followed before rats were sacrificed and blood sample collected. 7. Statistical analysis was not well written. The normal group should be compared with treatment groups and that should be the basis for determining the levels of significance. 8. Enzymes result should be written in a different table 9. The instruction for how p-value should be written was not followed 10. The references cited in the discussion is not sufficient.	Noted Noted and corrected Noted and corrected We only want to use male rats. In acute toxicity, the interest is to know the mortality rate on the animals. No further analysis will be required after then. In sub-acute toxicity further analyses are required. All the liver enzymes tested (ALT, AST and ALP) are all Biochemical parameters that is why they are included in the same table. P-value corrected Reference updated
Minor REVISION comments	1. In line 33, rats and aqueous extract should be removed from the keywords 2. There should be a reference or two backing up the assertion from line 37 to 45. 3. Line 60 to 66 should also have a reference 4. References 1 and 10 are not in line with the journals pattern of referencing	All noted and corrected
Optional/General comments	It worthy of note that if the necessary corrections are made, this manuscript will add to knowledge.	