



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_44353
Title of the Manuscript:	Subchronic toxicity study on serum biochemical parameters in wistar rats of the aqueous extract of the stem bark of <i>Sacoglottis gabonensis</i> (Baille) Urban (Humiriaceae)
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	It is a good paper with a correct and robust assay design. Failed in the description of results and conclusions, because the tables included are not clear On the other hand, in Materials and methods, point 2.5 The blood sampling techniques is not clear. Then it is necessary to clarify and if it is possibly rewrite this point in order to describe the blood sampling techniques in alive animals and the blood samples in slaughtering rats. In point 3.2 Effects of ETAS on plasma metabolites. The tables 1,2 and 3 are not clear and need a more deep modification in order to enhance their presentation and lecture. Finally, the exact role of the stem barks of <i>Sacoglottis gabonensis</i> on serum biochemical parameters specially Lactate dehydrogenase and Alkaline phosphatase need a revision and probable need to be rewrite the effects of this vegetable extract over all metabolites biochemical parameters.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juan Carlos Troiano
Department, University & Country	University of Buenos Aires, Argentina