



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	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- The name of the plant mentioned in the title and its subsequent uses seems to be incompatible. Did you mean <i>Chrysanthemum Indicum</i>? 2- More reference should be given to determining the doses used in this study. 3- Talking about the effects of this material on human clinical practice can enrich the study further. 4- It would be very valuable to enrich the content of the article by mentioning the chemical form and mechanism of action of the plant used in this study 5- "the acute toxicity of Chysanthellium indicum suggest its safety at 4000mg/kg body weight" It would be better to refer to other studies supporting this claim you mentioned in this sentence. 6- The purity of the agents should be determined by HPLC. 7- The result and discussion section should include more comparisons with previous studies. 8- The conclusion part should be expressed more clearly in the light of findings obtained by research and previous studies. 9- It would be better, after adding more recent published articles, in order to reflect that the manuscript refers to the most updated published works related to the discussed topic.	
Minor REVISION comments	10- There are some spelling mistakes. It is recommended that you review the whole article again. 11- What did you mean writing folkare (Line-59, 72). 12- The explanation section under the tables can make more explicit and informative	
Optional/General comments	13- Did you carry out the dose-response studies? If so, it would be better to include in supplementary data. 14- It would be better using schematic presentation for your groups. The naming of the groups can express more clearly. For Example; <i>Chrysanthemum Indicum</i> Acute toxicity; ChA500-ChA1000... <i>Chrysanthemum Indicum</i> Sub-acute toxicity; ChS0-ChS75... Ethical Issue- It would be better to declare the approval of the ethics committee to legitimate the executability of this study Plagiarism Issue- Similarity rate was detected by 27% I added the similarity report as an attachment file	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bora Taştekin
Department, University & Country	Department of Biophysics, Çukurova University, Turkey