



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_46748
Title of the Manuscript:	Relevance of Chrysanthellum americanum (L.) Vatke extracts in rat liver protection
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>Scientific name of Plants must be in italics. The experiments were performed in July 2011 and August 2012 and paper submitted now? Why there is a big gap between your experimentation and paper submission?</p> <p>Does your protocol have been approved from ethical committee? Does thy animal study perform blindfolded? What about the animal study is performed randomly? Kindly write complete protocol for animal studies What is the method for yield calculation? What food is given during animal studies? What are the housing facilities during animal studies?</p> <p>A number of grammar and spacing error Write complete protocol for Anti hepatotoxicity activity of <i>C. americanum</i> phenolic extract</p> <p>How rats were randomized during study?</p> <p>Picture quality for histopathological studies was not clear.</p> <p>The chemical equation during discussion must be written using latex or chem draw.</p> <p>Discussion has been written poorly and haphazardly. No clear information was given what is the outcome and how you correlated with the literature? Kindly rewrite your discussion and mentioned all the outcomes.</p> <p>How did you validate your results?</p>	We have corrected all this corrections in the revised manuscript
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> The protocol must be approved from ethical committee</p>	