

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Biochemistry Research &amp; Review</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJBCRR_102496</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Haematological and Biochemical Changes in aqueous leaf extract of Justicia carnea treated male Wistar rats exposed to lead acetate</b>
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> )

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> 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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript deals with the study of the medicinal properties of herbs used in Nigerian traditional medicine, which is a relevant scientific topic.</p> <p>Yes, it is. No remarks</p> <p>Yes, it is. No remarks</p> <p>Yes, no remarks. Particularly valuable the structure of the Discussion section.</p> <p>The authors clearly present the achieved results. The discussion of the results effectively balances enthusiasm and critical evaluation of the findings.</p> <p>The manuscript cited 34 references. Most of them are between 2017 – 2022.</p> <p>See Optional/general comments</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The overall language/English are very clear and suitable to communicate the achieved results. Only minor remarks and suggestion have been provided in the revised draft (see Microsoft Word comments).</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The aim of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of a medicinal herb (J. carnea) used in Nigerian traditional medicine within a scientific framework. The subject is both interesting and challenging. The authors pursued their objectives through an experimental design involving 40 male Wistar rats divided into 8 groups. The results are clearly presented and properly discussed. To enhance the comparability of these findings, I suggest to specify the methods and instrumentation used to perform haematological and biochemical analyses. On the benefit of future research, I would suggest that Authors consider to share as supplementary material a selection of the most relevant raw data presented in the manuscript. In the revised draft, there are some additional minor remarks that have been highlighted in yellow and explained using the Microsoft Word comments function.</p>	

### 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alessandro Nalesso
Department, University & Country	University of Padova, Italy