



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_43088
Title of the Manuscript:	Immune Modulatory Properties of Powdered Telfairia occidentalis Supplemented vital feed diet on male Wistar 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	Abstract: The supplemental groups mentioned is 0,5,10,& 20 but in results it is indicated as 0,5,10 & 15 which is correct. Always indicate the treatment groups like T1, T2 it is indicated as highest supplementation... it is not clear in the article which is highest percentage supplemental level. Introduction: In introduction, please indicate about any antinutritional factor factors present in the leaves of T. Occidentalis. if there how it is processed. Formulation of experimental diet: Like abstract here also it is mentioned that supplemental groups are 0,5,10,& 20 but in results it is indicated as 0,5,10 & 15 which is correct. In research, experimental diet is the base, please correctly indicate inclusion percentages. Please indicate the experimental diet composition and its standard for using in rats diet. then only it will clearly explained about the effects of supplementation. Procurement of Experimental Animals and Grouping Please indicate the treatment groups as T1,T2 it can be clearly understood in results and Discussion. There is no indication on which method the statistics analysis was done in this experiment. Feed Intake Determination: There is no formula indicated, it is left as such, what is the meaning for this.... Feed Intake (g/week) =? Catalase Activity It is mentioned as using the formula, herealso it is left as such... Catalase (μmol/min) =? In antioxidant determination, it is indicated as sample used... please mention which sample is used for antioxidant estimation. Results: As already mentioned, the supplemental mentioned is 0,5,10 & 15%, which is correct. There is no significant difference between the supplemented groups on feed intake, it should be indicated. Effect of <i>T. occidentalis</i> Feed Supplement on Hematological Parameters It is indicated that WBC count was increased in highest supplementation & there is no significant difference between 5 & 10 % groups, But in as per table results there is no significant difference between the treatment groups, only sig. Results between control & treatment groups. Same thing it is indicated for RBC. Correct it.	Authors very much appreciate the comments of the reviewers. We tried to improve the quality of the manuscript based on the thoughtful comments of the reviewers. We have thankfully acknowledged the contribution of the reviewers in the acknowledgement section of this manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	What is HGB? For Lymph and HGB there is no superscript in the table, but it is mentioned as difference is there with highest supplementation Correct it. <u>Effect of <i>T. occidentalis</i> Feed Supplement on Endogenous antioxidant:</u> In Table 3, What is <i>O.gratissimum</i>, where it is related to this trail, It is indicated as Superoxide dismutase and Catalase activity in activity was significantly high for 10% and 15% supplementation when compared to the control feed. Actually as per the table result, there is no significant difference between the T1, T2 & T3 . It should be corrected Exogenous Antioxidant determination Same for Exogenous Antioxidant determination, There is nosuperscript in the table , but indicated as significantly increased. <u>Discussion:</u> There is no much comparison between the present experiment to the other research works. Discussion should justify the results but only positive points are indicated. <u>Results:</u> It is concluded as palatable vegetable.... I think the research done on leaves which is used as dried... how it is recommended you didn't mention, further it cant be recommended as such, it can be concluded only after further expertiments it can be used for patients. There is nothing mentioned on antinutritional factor or palatability while using fresh also... clarify it.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The article should be revised in major things like supplementation percentage,,,,, What is the supplement used like that....	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		