



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_47000
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigation of Hepatoprotective and Antioxidant Activity of Celosia argentea Against Tissue Injury Caused by Rifampicin Administration
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>)

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>KINDLY SHARE PLANT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER KINDLY WRITE COMPLETE Preparation of aqueous extract EXTRACTION YIELD? WHERE IS THE ETHICAL COMMITTEE APPROVAL NUMBER? IN Figure 1. "The effects of time on different concentration of aqueous extract of C. argentea on inhibition of DPPH radical" Why you choose time to compare? it is wrong. it always relate to conc v % inhibition. Where is IC 50 VALUE? Table 1. Total phenolic content, DPPH radical scavenging value and Trolox equivalent antioxidant capacity (TEAC) of Celosia argentea DOES NOT COMPLY WITH YOUR RESULTS. SHOW ME YOUR META DATA OF Liver and Kidney lipid profiles</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correction effected in the manuscript 2. Correction effected in the manuscript 3. Correction effected in the manuscript 4. The graph presented showed the effect of different concentration of the extract at different time, it was related to % inhibition. To calculate the IC50 a graph that relate concentration against %inhibition was used (not presented in the manuscript). The value obtained is in result section and table 1 i.e 16.32 for gallic and 582.75 for the extract. 5. The table is in order and all the results correlated. Kindly, check again.
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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> <p>YES REQUIRED APPROVAL FROM ETHICAL COMMITTEE</p>	This has been provided in the corrected manuscript