

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_103112
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of the aqueous extract of Corchorus olitorius L. on the lipid parameters of rats subjected to a hyperlipidic diet
Type of the 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)
<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?</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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, I believe that it makes a good contribution to the subject with some deficiencies that I believe should be resolved to complete the publication process.\</p> <p>And</p> <p>And</p> <p>Yes, in part. It presents strong weaknesses in relation to the theoretical framework and that leads to a very weak discussion. It should be corrected to complete the publishing process.</p> <p>In part, the discussion is very weak and that strongly affects its scientific value. It occurs probably because the theoretical framework is weak.</p> <p>This is a weak point of the work, since I understand more recent works should be cited. I leave a link where I perceived that there could be articles that could be useful. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/?term=rats+hyperlipidic+diet&filter=datesearch.y_5&size=100</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I cannot refer to this item with much precision since English is not my mother tongue. With this exception, from my perspective it seemed to me that it has some weaknesses.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[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:	Gabriel Tapia
Department, University & Country	Universidad de la República, Uruguay