

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Biotechnology Journal International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_90759
Title of the Manuscript:	HEPATOPROTECTIVE ACTIVITY OF AN AQUEOUS EXTRACT OF CASHEW APPLE ( <i>Anacardium occidentale</i> ) IN RATS AND MICE
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://www.journalbjournal.com/index.php/BJI/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The Abstract Needs Major revision to show the experimental design for proper understanding of the study, so that the audience can understand the study independent of the main work. Comments are attached for authors revision.</b></li> <li>The process of Extraction lacks scientific justification to hepatoprotective claims. See reviewer's comments in manuscript</li> <li>Add Acknowledgement and declare conflict of interest.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard deviation values should contain decimal points and not comma. See reviewer's comments in manuscript.</li> <li>References should be modified according to Journal format</li> <li>Key words are not in accordance to journal format</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authors use of English in sentences appears poor. The use of a standards translator should be employed.</li> <li>Author should use standard abbreviations for biomarkers and not self-formulated abbreviations.</li> </ol> <p>However, Author can modify the manuscript to reflect what was done. Example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The test plant should be "cashew apple cake aqueous extract", not cashew apple aqueous extract.</li> <li>The author should suggest the hepatoprotective effect due to the markers, and not an affirmative conclusion of hepatoprotective effect</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>  1. The method of Extraction for the Aqueous extract is not justifiable scientifically. 2. Also, the biomarkers analysed are not sufficient to the claims in the finding of the study  (See reviewers detailed explanation in the manuscript)	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Odinga Tamuno-Boma</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rivers State University, Nigeria</b>