



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_47339
Title of the Manuscript:	Toxicological, Biochemical and Haematological Studies of Ethyl acetate Extract of Persea americana Leaf in Albino 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>Paraphrase the title, be specific with the title “Biochemical indices and haematological studies of Ethyl acetate Extract of <i>Persea americana</i> Leaf in Albino Rats”</p> <p>In the area highlighted in red in the abstract, be specific with the exposure concentration administered.</p> <p>Remove the words highlighted in blue in the abstract. It is redundant.</p> <p>The area highlighted in purple was poorly written. Strengthen the results summary.</p> <p>Paraphrase the words highlighted in purple in the introduction.</p> <p>In 2.3, check “ of either sex” which sex was used in the study?</p> <p>In 2.4, wasn't the body weight of the rats considered? If so it was not reported in the designed. You should also outline in full the meaning of the abbreviations in the same 2.4.</p> <p>In 2.4 assay, they were written passively. Why not state for instance AST and ALT determination using Reitman and Frankel, [21]. Do so for the rest of the assay methods.</p> <p>All tools used for the statistical study and result presentation are not reported. Do so.</p> <p>In 3.1, I doubt this “However, significant increase ($P<0.05$) was observed in serum level of ALT of the entire treated group when compared with normal control (Figure 1)” It appears it is not significant. Kindly provide the raw data or verify that.</p> <p>I also doubt the interpretation given in fig 2. Review the data. It is not true. Check the globulin, there were no significant differences in protein and albumin.</p> <p>Verify the interpretation of fig. 5. How about the statement on VLDL.</p> <p>In table 1. Be consistent with the figure. Use 0.10 and .10, do so in others.</p> <p>Table each figure and table just below each of the results interpretation.</p> <p>The discussion is vague. It has to be worked on.</p> <p>The conclusion was poorly written.</p> <p>Check reference no. 6 and others to verify.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Attend to the issues raised above and check for grammatical syntax.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Uchendu, Mbah Okuwa</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Nigeria</i>