

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_100183
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of the Impact of aqueous extract of <i>Telfairia occidentalis</i> on the haematological profile and blood film of 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.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)
<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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the article is comprehensive</p> <p>5. The manuscript has not satisfied all for it to be scientifically correct:</p> <p>a) There were assumptions made in the article with no reference to back it up.</p> <p>b) Even though the method stated that there will be statistical analysis using one - way ANOVA, there was no test for significant difference shown in the manuscript. Therefore, one can't say if difference observed is a coincidence or if it is actually influenced by administration of the aqueous extract of the leaves</p> <p>c) It was implied at one point in the paper that the administration of the aqueous extract might have caused injury leading to proliferation of antioxidants in the body. I subjectively feel this is contradictory.</p> <p>6. Some of the references are not recent and they are highlighted with yellow in the manuscript.</p> <p>7. Texts highlighted in green were plagiarized.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Generally, the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. Places that are ambiguous or incorrect, I have pointed out in the manuscript for due corrections to be made</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The study is a good one but discussions may have to be generally rewritten. It sounded ambiguous and contradictory in some areas. Perhaps irrelevant information may be expunged from the manuscript (this is subject to the author's desires). Newer references should be cited and statistical analysis, testing significant difference should be carried out.</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:	Ifeoma Cynthia Ekenna
Department, University & Country	University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria