



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_31357
Title of the Manuscript:	HEPATOPROTECTIVE EFFECT OF AQUEOUS BARK EXTRACT OF BOSWELLIA DALZIELLI AGAINST PARACETAMOL INDUCED HEPATOTOXICITY IN RABBITS
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	I checked your work and there are still some problems: Collection of Plant Sample- Note due to the wide resembles of the plant with other plant types, the picture of the full and parts of the plants used should put in the materials and method. 10g of the residue was diluted in 500ml of distilled water. How did you concentrate to 50g/ml Dosage calculation 0.5g -1ml= 500mg 5g - 10ml=500g Note :if 50mg/ml for stock solution as an extract for clarification meaning each rabbit received 10ml of Pcm to induce the hepatotoxicity. Don't you think the volume is too high (much). With your calculation of pcm dose please state the source of pcm and all chemical and equipment used in this study Also : starting a paragraph with arithmetic is not good in a sentence it should be word e.g. five gram(5g), male. As in the case of treatment of animals, where you should start as five groups not 5 group. Also the choice of silymarin is very appropriate but while the dose of 25mg/kg, please cite some previous authors work with similar dose and the 500mg/kg dose of PCM or reason. The biochemical analysis This should have been separated from simple collection in order to explain appropriately what was done e.g 1. If sample was collected after the last treatment. 2. Decapitation before blood collection knowing well that over 15 to 20ml of blood can be collected from the rabbit ear without causing hemorrhagic to the rabbit and rabbit blood coagulates faster than all other lab animals. How was the liver extracted from the rabbit, add a brief explanation and	The pictures of the full and parts of the plant has been inserted. The dosage calculation has been corrected. Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	stating the reference for each biochemical parameter assayed for clarity and replication, knowing well that both Randox and Teco reagent are different procedures. The statistical analysis package use was not fully stated, noting the version, year and country. Result and Discussion should be separated I) Result is the interpretation of data generated and level of significance The result table lack merit, being that the table is not well arrange, the parameters don't have unit and the statistical interpretation is not clear, mean significant different was not clearly stated i.e No description of the superscripts a, b, c, d. showing signs of significance decrease or increase compared with both control and experimental group. For ALP: is there any reason why the value after treatment with 225mg/kg body weight Bd is alot lower than the value in the normal group (6.25 ± 0.00) and (28.12 ± 4.41) Histopathological finding- signs should be used to explain the different section of the liver seen with changes in the histological picture. For example, A, B, not coluor arrows (red and green) should be stated underneath each slide. li) Discussion is the correlation of result with other study. The possible bioactive constituent of the plant should be mentioned The purported mode of action of the plant should be mentioned This appears to be acute study (i.e induced and treatment within (days) would the plant be useful in managing a chronic toxicity? REFERENCES A number of irregularities: please review SDI reference style Update the references and make sure half of the references are in recent 3 years!!!! (2012-2015), another one-fourth references are in recent 5 years (i.e. 2010-2015). Old references are better replaced with updated ones. References must meet these requirements!!!! Citations should be labeled with square bracket and should appear in front of the period or comma at the end of the sentence/clause. All references should be cited. It is better to include citation from Pubmed, the more the better. We suggest you search the key words on PMC and add new references to your paper.	Liver extraction has been demonstrated. References for biochemical parameters stated. Result and discussion has been separated. All units and statistical interpretations were corrected. Actually the issue of this ALP result was a mistake that occurs while compiling this manuscript because that wasn't the initial result. It was 26.25 ± 0.05 not 6.25 ± 0.00 Letters (A,B,C,D and E) are used for the different liver sections. It could be used in managing chronic toxicity with continued administration.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Ethical Issue-No institutional ethic committee approval for the experimental design. Plagiarism Issue-Plagiarism Checker X Originality Report Similarity Found: 22% Date: Friday, January 06, 2017 Statistics: 583 words Plagiarized / 2694 Total words Remarks: Medium Plagiarism Detected - Your Document needs Selective Improvement. INTERNET SOURCES: ----- --- 0% - Empty 0% - http://skeptvet.com/Blog/2015/05/evidenc 3% - http://www.ajol.info/index.php/ijhpr/art 0% - http://www.niscair.res.in/ScienceCommuni 0% - https://www.researchgate.net/profile/End 1% - http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007 0% - http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Ado 0% - http://www.jicep.com/?mno=203209 0% - http://www.science.gov/topicpages/b/bosw 1% - https://issuu.com/alexanderdecker/docs/q 2% - http://wudpeckerresearchjournals.org/WJP 1% - https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Rah 1% - http://ijppr.com/PDF/6/IJPPR,Vol6,Issue4 2% - http://wudpeckerresearchjournals.org/WJP 2% - http://wudpeckerresearchjournals.org/WJP 1% - https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Hoz 1% - https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Hoz 0% - https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Emm 1% - https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Hoz 0% - http://www.aensiweb.com/old/anas/2009/40 1% - http://www.herbapolonica.pl/magazines-fi 0% - http://link.springer.com/referenceworken 0% - http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article 1% - http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10. 1% - http://www.bioline.org.br/request?np0900	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	0% - http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/art 0% - http://www.nature.com/cgt/journal/v9/n7/ 0% - http://www.academia.edu/4511491/Hepatoto 0% - http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstr 1% - http://www.mathgoodies.com/lessons/graph 0% - http://www.ajol.info/index.php/ajb/artic 0% - http://eprints.cmfri.org.in/2155/1/Murty 1% - https://www.researchgate.net/publication 3% - http://www.ajol.info/index.php/ijhpr/art 3% - http://www.ajol.info/index.php/ijhpr/art 3% - http://www.ajol.info/index.php/ijhpr/art 3% - http://www.ajol.info/index.php/ijhpr/art 0% - http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/art 3% - http://www.ajol.info/index.php/ijhpr/art 0% - http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=s 0% - https://www.scribd.com/document/25375643 1% - http://m.catalog.designsforhealth.com/Ar 1% - http://www.academia.edu/8377129/Hepaprot 0% - http://www.japtr.org/article.asp?issn=22 1% - https://www.researchgate.net/publication 1% - http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007 0% - http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.10 0% - https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/article 0% - http://www.academia.edu/12604794/The_the 0% - https://www.researchgate.net/publication	Ethical issue was an oversight, but it has been settled. Plagiarism: I have made necessary corrections on all the words and sentences that are being highlighted with the exception of those that I think cannot be changed. For example: 1. Under place and duration of study in the abstract section, there is faculty of Basic Medical Sciences which is the name of the faculty and can't be changed. 2. So also areas where the biochemical parameters are listed; ALP, AST etc. The name is just a general one. 3. Reference section; so many references were highlighted which I don't think it will be wise to change the authors names and journals or their arrangements.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Animal grouping / treatment: use scientific research language such as positive control and negative control. Histopathological analysis: haematoxyle ad eosin not haematoxyle ad cosin	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		