

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Hepatology	
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRHE_46310	
Title of the Manuscript:	POTENTIAL PROTECTIVE EFECT OF ANACARDIUM OCCIDENTALE AGAINST PARACETAMOL-INDUCED HEPATOTOXI	
Type of the Article	Original Research Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

XICITY



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed highlight that part in the many his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Topic Suggested title: Protective potential of Anacardium occidentale leaves against paracetamol-induced hepatotoxicity Abstract: Line 5:	
	Some of the in-text citation were not listed in the reference such as Jaouad, 2004	
Minor REVISION comments	Materials and MethodsLine 60: ground not groundedLine 60: 250 mL not 250 mls2.2.1 Induction of hypertotoxicityTwenty healthy rats were induced with 1000 mg of paracetamol dissolved in 100 ml ofdistilled water to give a concentration of 10 mg/ml.	
Optional/General comments	Author should detailed the identification or authentication of the plant with appropriate voucher number There are two different ethical approvals in the article, one under materials and methods as 2.1.3 and the other on line 151 after competing interests; author should reconcile. References should be according to the journal's format. The study presents scientific merit but there is poor attention to the preparation of the manuscript. The manuscript required total overhauling The article should be rejected base on the absence of the positive control group	

eed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and anuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with that part in the manuscript. It is n feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) There are two different ethical approvals in the article, one under materials and methods as 2.1.3 and the other on line 151 after competing interests; author should reconcile.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Omoboyowa D. A.
Department, University & Country	Ondo State University of Science and Technology, Nigeria

with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight s mandatory that authors should write his/her