



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJANR_50202
Title of the Manuscript:	BIOASSAY- GUIDED FRACTIONATION OF CARICA PAPAYA SEED EXTRACTS AGAINST POTASSIUM BROMATE- INDUCED NEPHROTOXICITY DETECTED FATTY ACID- RICH COMPOUNDS AND PREVENTS OXIDATIVE STRESS IN RAT'S KIDNEY
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=sd-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>Page 1 line 10. The aim of this study: To identify the bioactive constituents of <i>Carica papaya</i> seed with effect against potassium bromate –induced nephrotoxicity and oxidative stress in renal tissue of rat.</p> <p>The future aim is for a preventive or curative treatment for kidney damage? Please kindly explain.</p> <p>Page 1 line 23-26: in Abstract, Study design: For each state of polarity, twenty male Wistar rats were divided into four groups, five rats per group; normal control, KBrO₃ control, <i>papaya</i> fraction control and KBrO₃ group administered with required concentration of extract of <i>C. papaya</i> seed for 48 hours.</p> <p>So the treatment only 48 hours? Is there any reference to convince that statement? What is the reason that author choose only 48 hours design? Please kindly explain.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Page 1 line 23-26: in Abstract, Results: Fractionation of <i>C. papaya</i> seed yielded fractions and sub-fractions with potency against KBrO₃–induced increases in serum urea, creatinine, uric acid and electrolytes as well as the level of MDA.</p> <p>So the treatment increases the kidney function parameters, and free radicals (MDA) which means it is getting worsened? The sentence is not clear enough. Please kindly restructure the sentence, to avoid a misinterpretation by reader</p> <p>Page 2 line 74: 25 matured unripe <i>C. papaya</i>. Please kindly state a clear sentence to avoid reader confused</p> <p>Line 81: Watman, should be Whatman</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Reviewer's comment</p> <p>This is an interesting study however further research is needed to become nephroprotectant and new antioxidants to the action of bromine potassium in kidney.</p>	

PART 2:



SDI Review Form 1.6

	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></p> <p>It is not clearly state in the manuscript. The author just state: All animal procedures were performed according to the guide for the care and use of laboratory animals of the National Institute of Health as well as the Animal Welfare Act. Line 140</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Meilinah Hidayat
Department, University & Country	Universitas Kristen Maranatha Bandung, Indonesia