

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_97893
Title of the Manuscript:	In vivo antivenom effect of <i>Mucuna pruriens</i> and <i>Millettia pinnata</i> (Fabaceae) minerals on biochemical parameters of <i>Oryctolagus cuniculus</i>
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.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/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		
<p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, important for discovery of antivenom sources.</p> <p>2. I suggest to revised the title to "Screening of <i>Mucuna pruriens</i> and <i>Millettia pinnata</i> (Fabaceae) minerals on biochemical parameters of <i>Oryctolagus cuniculus</i> as antivenom"</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes, appropriately subsections however there are some clarifications that needs to be addressed for better understanding of our reader. In the methodology, the plant materials <i>Mucuna pruriens</i> and <i>Millettia pinnata</i> were incinerated at in a muffle furnace for 13 hours at 550 °C. By doing this method the bioactives present in the plants are already destroyed. How can you claim that these plants are effective both as a preventive and curative agent when the present compounds were incinerated? Also in the methodology, the viper skull was incinerated in a muffle furnace for 13 hours at 550 °C. It not a method for collecting venom. Venom is present in the salivary glands of the viper. To be able to extract the venom, you will need an alive viper, not the ashes of the skull.</p> <p>5. The methodology is incorrect. Kindly search for a more appropriate method.</p> <p>6. References are correctly written</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anna Muriel T. Jacinto
Department, University & Country	Industrial Technology Development Institute, Philippines