



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_25194
Title of the Manuscript:	Anti-oxidative and Hepato-protective effects of Pseudocedrela kotschy against Paracetamol Induced Liver damage: A Biochemical and Histological evaluation in 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	The manuscript is well written and showed that the extracts of <i>Pseudocedrela kotschy</i> could protect the liver cells from paracetamol damage, perhaps, by its antioxidative effect. INTRODUCTION: At line-30, "as a readily" should be corrected to "are readily". At line-35, "and it extract have been shown" should be corrected to "and its extracts have been shown". -The aim of the work should be mentioned at the end of introduction. MATERIALS AND METHODS: At line-89, "injection (150 mg/ml)" should be omitted. RESULTS: -The results of Tables 1, 2 and Figures 1,2 and 3 should be described in detail in the results part. DISCUSSION:	The English grammar in line 30 is correct, and should therefore remain as 'as a readily' It has been corrected This has been inserted "injection (150mg/ml)" has been deleted. Clear description of key notes for interpretation has been put under those figures and tables. "was" has been inserted This has been corrected. "5 has been changed to 9"



SDI Review Form 1.6

	At line-211, "the difference of which statistically insignificant" should be corrected to "the difference of which was statistically insignificant". At line-221, "in group 5" should be corrected to "in group 9". At line-261, "conspicuous lowered" should be corrected to "significantly higher". At line-306, "differences was statistically significant" should be corrected to "differences were statistically significant". <u>REFERENCES:</u> At line-433, "and it mechanism based prevention" should be corrected to "and its mechanism based prevention". At line-441, "2008; 74(1)80." should be corrected to "2008; 74(1): 80-?". Please clarify the ethical issue, if any	Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected No ethical issue. The rules against cruelty to animals were however observed
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	No	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No	