



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_50608
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Annona Muricata Extract On Colon Antioxidant Status and Ketone Bodies in Blood and Urine of Cycas-Treated Rats
Type of the Article	Original Research

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>1. Title: The extract was obtained from the leaves hence—.. Effect of Annona Muticata leaves extract....</p> <p>2. It would have been advisable to do immunohistochemical analysis after histopathology to ascertain the pharmacological claims</p> <p>3. The quantitative detection of early and late apoptosis should be done using correlation statistical analysis or Dunnet's multiple comparison test.</p> <p>4. Phytochemical analysis on the leaf extract is required</p> <p>5. Clinical trial and experiment protocols needs to be followed eg Animal and Ethic statements is missing, what time sample is taken.. etc</p> <p>6. Antioxidant capacity studies of the extract is need since it is mentioned too in your title</p> <p>7. Cell viability studies based on MTT assay is inevitable . This gives a very strong upper hand on your claims</p>	<p>Have done that.</p> <p>No need, as we did a biochemical analysis, besides, at the momemt, our lab is unable to do that.</p> <p>I think that would not be necessary as we did a t-test.</p> <p>There are already enough literature on the phytochemical properties of the leaf extracts.</p> <p>Experimental protocols as used in the research were presented. Also, animal and ethics approvals were given orally.</p> <p>The antioxidant properties were carried out <i>in vivo</i>.</p> <p>Agreed, but due to limited funds, we couldn't go beyond this point. We fund our researches at the moment.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Recommendations for your studies is manadatory</p>	<p>I don't think so, since this is purely an academic work and an advocacy work.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>. Revise your abstract and limit it to not more than 250 words.</p>	<p>Ok, done</p>

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></p>	<p>No, there are none</p>