



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IRJGH_48092</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Potency of Bombax costatum Stem-bark Extract As a Hepato-curative Agent On Acetaminophen Induced Hepato Toxicity In Wistar Albino Rats</b>
Type of the 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Change the title to “Hepato-curative and haema-improvement Potentials of <i>Bombax costatum</i> Stem-bark methanolic Extract On Acetaminophen Induced Hepato-Toxicity In Wistar Albino Rats”</b></p> <p><b>All the abbreviation must first be written in full. They are highlighted in red in the abstract. The numbers of rats used are not accurately reported. How about the 20 rats used for toxicity study. Did the test last for 20 days or 21 days? See line 130.</b></p> <p><b>Remove the words in red in the keywords.</b></p> <p><b>There are lots of grammatical errors in the manuscript.</b></p> <p><b>The referencing style in the body of the work is not in accordance with SDI Authors' guideline.</b></p> <p><b>The introduction is poorly written. It should consider intimating the audience about acetaminophen and its effects and not to integrate the other liver disease conditions like NAFLD,HCC etc.</b></p> <p><b>Remove lines 31 – 39 and 49 – 58. The rest of the highlighted places in red are to be verified.</b></p> <p><b>Line 94 – 95 is not clear. 70% v/v methanol/water mixture? Extraction lasted for 48 h.? using rotary evaporator, At what temperature?</b> Line 98 – 99, does not synchronize with line 94. Line 110, what is the temperature and humidity of the laboratory where the rats were kept? <b>In 2.8, group 2 and 3 seem to have been exposed to the same treatment. Verify and revise.</b></p> <p><b>Line 138, did you use 70 % methanol or 70% v/v methanol/water? Verify and revise.</b></p> <p><b>2.11, what about the other test methods for Albumin, cholesterol, urea, direct and indirect bilirubin? Provide them.</b></p> <p><b>In table 2, what is T/D?</b></p> <p><b>In table 3, verify the use of different alphabets in the separation of significant differences. They are highlighted in red.</b></p> <p><b>The DBIL and IDBIL are questionable? They are highlighted in red. For AST and ALP verify the values.</b> <b>Perhaps why use three observation when should had 5 rats per group?</b></p> <p><b>Line 257 – 260, verify this. “Of interest to note is the improvement in the Hb, PCV and RBC indices that compares favourably (<math>P \leq 0.05</math>) with the standard drug (Silymarin) while a continuous significant decrease (<math>P \leq 0.05</math>) in these indices was observed in the negative control group” From the table of result, this doesn't hold true.</b></p>	<p>The observation is well appreciated, but “haema-improvement” may not need to feature prominently due to the fact that, liver recovery is generally known to be accompanied with decrease in some enzymes and general increase in the most of the haematological indices.</p> <p>Thank you for the kind onservation</p> <p>Will do that where necessary</p> <p>Thorough edition will be carried out</p> <p>Thanks for the observation</p> <p>Extraction differs from solvent removal sir. So rotary evaporator was not employed at this level. Line 98-99 does surely synchronise with 94 Line 110: Careful scrutiny of the “Experimental site” will resolve this issue</p> <p>Thanks for the observation on the typographical error.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>That is exactly what we got and we are comfortable presenting it as such rather than changing the result to suit our interest.</p> <p>We merged our results with the discussion which is acceptable in the scientific community.</p> <p>We don't consider this to be compulsory.</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>The discussion is vague and ambiguous. It has to be made lucid.</p> <p>The author has to separate the results tables and their interpretation and the discussion section. This is vital.</p> <p>There is no concluding statement.</p> <p>The references should be in accordance with the <b>AUTHORS' GUIDELINE</b>.</p>	Thanks for the observation Noted
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Attend to the raised issues	

**PART 2:**

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

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

Kindly see the following link:

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