

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_99270
Title of the Manuscript:	Honey attenuates Phenylhydrazine-induced Hematotoxicity and Oxidative Stress in male Wistar 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://www.journalibrr.com/index.php/IBRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <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>Yes. People are moving away from raw/table sugar. Honey possesses antioxidant potentials</p> <p>The title is suitable. However, it can be modified in order to bring about core aim of the study</p> <p>The Abstract is comprehensive enough to capture all areas.</p> <p>Yes!</p> <p>Yes with slight modifications.</p> <p>The references are relatively adequate and comprehensive. However, more recent references can be obtained</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The author should introduce Vetting of English</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>SHORTCOMING OF THE MANUSCRIPT</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No procedure of phenylhydrazine (PHZ)-induced toxicity in Methodology. 2. The Introduction did not capture the mechanism of phenylhydrazine (PHZ)-induced toxicity. 3. The study design should have at least 3 controls (Normal, Untreated and Standard Control). 4. Why the choice of female rats? 5. Rats with body weight of 200 to 250 g is considered overweight in this work. 6. Why didn't the author include glutathione peroxidase (GPx) in the category of antioxidant enzymes? 7. The differential white blood cell counts should be more embrasive e.g. basophil, eosinophil, etc. 8. What type of ANOVA (Is it one- or two- way ANOVA)? 9. Kindly rewrite your results with detailed and careful comparison of the treated groups with the control. 10. The Discussion should embrace implications of the findings and comparing the findings with the findings of other researchers. 11. The conclusion should more definite and pointed as anchored on the outcome of the Results. 	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Parker Elijah Joshua
Department, University & Country	University of Nigeria, Nigeria