



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_48320
Title of the Manuscript:	Antipuritive Effect of aqueous root extracts of Moringa Oliefera on alcohol induced Haematotoxicity in 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	<p>Remove the discussion section of the abstract. Reduce the bulky content of the concluding statement of the same abstract.</p> <p>The referencing style is not in line the SDI authors' guideline. Fix them.</p> <p>The first two paragraphs of the introduction are redundant. Revise.</p> <p>1.5/kg ?</p> <p>Which standard rodent pellet was used?</p> <p>In the table for experimental design what is RMO?</p> <p>Check the statistical approach $p=0.005$?</p> <p>In table 2, review the data indicator of significant difference for the ones highlighted in red.</p> <p>Choose one form of result presentation, either the table or the figures.</p> <p>Use $P=.05$ as required by the SDI authors' guideline. Check for the p value been used throughout the result interpretation.</p> <p>Italicize the botanical names.</p> <p>The concluding statements should be reflection from the scope of the present work.</p> <p>The referencing style is not in accordance with SDI authors' guideline. Fix them.</p>	<p>Revise the abstract</p> <p>Formatted as per the comments</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected value given</p> <p>Correction done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Correction made in the manuscript</p> <p>Conclusion modified</p> <p>Reference style has been corrected as per guidelines</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	ATTEND TO THE RAISED ISSUES AND FIX THE GRAMMATICAL ERRORS.	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:



SDI Review Form 1.6

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

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>	