



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_45735
Title of the Manuscript:	Haematological Changes in Administration of Chrysophyllum Albidu Stem Extract to Wistar Rats
New Title of the Manuscript:	Haematological Changes in Administration of <i>Chrysophyllum albidu</i> Stem Extract to Wistar Rats
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>This is a revised manuscript. However, it still contains several confusing description, which make it hard to comprehend. In addition, the authors have not addressed all the requests that were raised in the first round of revision. The authors must address each comment one by one and carefully revise the manuscript.</p> <p>Specific comment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In the first round of revision, I requested the authors to explain the reason why the body weight of the control rat decreased during the treatment period (Figure 1); however, this question has not been addressed in the revision. It is hard to understand why the control rat body weight decreased. It is generally assumed that the body weight of control rat that did not receive any treatment stays the same. Were there any specific reason that explain the reduction of body weight of control rat? The text explaining the result was added. The explanation in Figure 2 says that Low dose group had an insignificant increase ($47.75 \pm 0.63 - 38.00 \pm 4.02$) when compared to control and medium dose group. This indicates that low dose did not reach statistically significant; however, the abstract states that low dose treated group showed an increase in PCV values upon comparison. If this increase did not reach statistically significant, it should not be stated in the abstract. The new result description for Figure 3 says that high dose group shows slight difference when compared with medium dose group. This however did not attain significant. The readers would like to know if Hemoglobin in high dose group was significantly decreased when compared with control group, but not the medium group. This must be shown in the results. The abstract says that Study found a statistically significant decrease in PCV and haemoglobin levels for group IV (high dose treated) when compared with other groups. Now, the revised statement in the first paragraph on page 8 says careful analysis observed a statistically significant decrease in Haemoglobin and PCV levels within the duration of treatment with <i>C. albidum</i> leave extract at low, medium and high doses respectively. If I understand correct, statistically significant decrease of hemoglobin and PCV was observed only in the high dose treated group. The authors must double check the text. Similarly, the conclusion contains very confusing sentence that states opposite to the description in the abstract. It says <i>C. albidum</i> has caused a great deal of increase in blood volume for treated rats. However, the abstract says Study found a statistically significant decrease in PCV and haemoglobin levels for group IV (high dose treated) when compared with other groups. Finally, the brief description of the results section was provided, based on the comment by the reviewer; however, what was provided in this revision was so called figure legend, but not the result description. The authors must look up other published scientific papers in order to understand the style of the manuscript. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> For figure 1, actual comparison was made between groups and the control. I.e, control was the reference upon which comparison was done. Statement meant to say that "a statistically significant increase in body weight was seen between groups (fed with extract) when compared with control" now corrected; with possible reason added in discussion. Thanks. The presented values ($47.75 \pm 0.63 - 38.00 \pm 4.02$) were the average (mean) valued we obtained upon comparisons of differences in mean (Using ANOVA). They are not the outcome of the ANOVA test, but expression of outcomes as mean \pm Standard Deviation. When we said that Low dose group had an insignificant increase, we meant the value returned by the ANOVA test, and not the one quoted. That was the statistical basis on which significance was judged (increase or decrease). Even though it was not given, it is very important to have it mentioned as such, even within the abstract. In the footnote for figure 3, we did implicate comparison with control when we said "The Hb was seen to have mildly increased in low dose group when compared with control groups" what else would the reader love to see ? the figure also clearly matched the values for each group with those of control. This was also neatly detailed in the discussion. The text was double-checked with no error seen. The two statements (pointed out by reviewers) are consistent with what we meant to say. i.e, "a statistically significant decrease was seen in PCV and hemoglobin levels of groups (low, medium, and high dose treated)" Rechecked and corrected appropriately. All result descriptions were dealt with in the discussion section. Only a snippet was presented as footnote in each table