

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_89773
Title of the Manuscript:	Fractions of Aqueous Extract of <i>Plumbago zeylanica</i> (L.) Root induced Mitochondrial Membrane Permeability Transition Pore Opening in Rats
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:

(<https://journalijbcr.com/index.php/IJBCRR/editorial-policy>)

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	The authors provide us very useful information which was evaluated the effects of crude aqueous extract of the root bark of <i>Plumbago zeylanica</i> (PZ) on the opening of the mitochondrial membrane permeability transition pore in rat liver. The pore opening, mitochondrial ATPase activity, lipid peroxidation and liver function markers were assessed spectrophotometrically while caspase 9 activity and liver morphology were monitored by immunohistochemistry and histology respectively. It is interesting research that all fractions of PZ induced pore opening and enhanced the activity of caspase-9. Significant increases were observed in the mitochondrial ATPase activity while the level of malondialdehyde was significantly reduced. The results concluded that aqueous fractions of PZ have bioactive agents capable of altering mitochondrial bioenergetics and inducing the opening of MMPT pore with mild hepatotoxicity. The current version of the manuscript is very interesting and informative. Overall, the manuscript is written clearly, and the data are presented appropriately and can support the conclusions made. I recommend the current version of manuscript for acceptance after considering the minor changes as mention below.	
Minor REVISION comments	Reference style is not consistent	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Akram
Department, University & Country	University of Management and Technology, Pakistan