

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_98223
Title of the Manuscript:	Histopathological Profile of Obese Zebrafish Liver After Administration of Red Spinach (<i>Amaranthus tricolor</i> L.)
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.journalejmp.com/index.php/EJMP/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? I believe this article has a minimal impact on the scientific community. 2. Is the title of the article suitable? Yes, the title is appropriate. 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Yes. 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? I believe that within what is proposed, yes. 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. Yes, references are sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article is adequate. However, the groups could be better named as the normal diet group and the fatty diet group.	
Optional/General comments	In experimental design section: The paragraph is repeated from the abstract. Please provide more details on periods and management for administration. What is the diet of the control group? In conclusion section: Present limitations of the study.	

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:	Francisco Bruno Costa Cepp
Department, University & Country	UNINTA, Brazil