



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_47486
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of liver protective activity of Moringa oleifera bark extract in paracetamol induced hepatotoxicity 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	<p><u>General comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The scope of study was too small. Only blood serum analysis was performed. I wonder why was the histopathological examination was not performed and presented in this study. Minor grammar and typo issues. No attempt to determine the phytochemical content of ethanolic extract of <i>M. oliefera</i>. This part is important when working with natural products. <p><u>Specific comments</u></p> <p><u>Abstract</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Background; Re-write the objective part. Results; Give real data, not vague terms. <p><u>Introduction</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Too many typo errors. Some sentences need to be re-written. Techniques in citing information need to be improved. <p><u>Materials and Methods</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Plant collection and extraction; Line 1; Where is Savar area. Please provide accurate location. Plant collection and extraction; Line 2; "... authenticated by the Dept. of Botany ..."??? The plant is authenticated by somebody not the department!!! Provide the name of the botanist/taxonomist. Plant collection and extraction; How did the authors achieved "... shed dried at 35-40°C..."? Plant collection and extraction; What was the ratio of sample to solvent used in the extraction process? Plant collection and extraction; What was the percentage yield of solid mass? Experimental animals; Line 6-7; Provide the ethical approval reference number. Toxicity study; Provide the OECD guidelines used to perform the toxicity study. Experimental design for the assessment of liver functions; Why was only two doses used in the present study as this could not provide the dose-response information? Experimental design for the assessment of liver functions; The authors wrote "...Tabassum N and Agrawal SS (2004) with slight modification with error and trial [27]. ..."; What did the authors mean by "with error and trial"? Experimental design for the assessment of liver functions; Why was blood collection performed after the animals were sacrificed? How was the blood collection made? <p><u>Results and Discussion</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All results should be reported based on the statistical analysis. Remove all terms such as "slightly increased", "slightly decreased" etc. If the data is not significant please report them as an insignificant finding(s). Table 1 and Figure 1 represented the same results. Choose only one format of 	<p>1.,Due to the lacking of funding we were unable to perform histopathological examination , As we do not have any external funding or support.</p> <p>2. Has been checked</p> <p>3.Please note that phytochemical constituents has already been established by other research which is presented in introduction .As a result we skip it .</p> <p>Abstract and introduction has been corrected according to reviewer comments .</p> <p>Material and Methods 1,2,3,4,5 ,6 – corrected according to suggestion .</p> <p>The ratio was 96 :4 of ethanol and water.</p> <p>% yield was 6.07%</p> <p>OECD 425 was followed.</p> <p>Only two doses were used to save cost as the study was done with personal funding.</p> <p>The authors tried to induce toxicity in their lab with paracetamol by slight modification for several times and finalized the mentioned dose which actually</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>presentation.</p> <p>3. Table 2 and Figure 2 represented the same results. Choose only one format of presentation.</p> <p>4. Table 2; ALP activity for MO 500 mg/kg was not significant. Are you sure?</p> <p>5. Table 3 and Figure 4 represented the same results. Choose only one format of presentation.</p>	<p>induced. It was meant as error and trial.</p> <p>Blood collectio was made from portal vein after sacrifice.</p> <p>Result and discussion : corrected as per reviewer direction . Only Figure has choosed to present</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	