

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>The manuscript is relevant for knowledge based teaching but don't think is important for scientific community as the leaf in particular which is used in the study (<i>Telfairia occidentalis</i>) is an important vegetable for human consumption hence may not be significant for use in animal research purpose let alone having impact to the scientific community.</p> <p>yes Moderately okay yes</p> <p>The References is sufficient but not Recent so is advisable the author replace the very old references with recent ones Secondly, Many of the references cited in the body of the work is not referenced at the end of the write up Examples Guyton and Hall, 1996; Laki, 1972; Wepner <i>et al.</i>, 1992; Ugochukwu, 2003; etc. etc.....</p> <p>The author should add more meaningful write up to introductory part so as to have a robust knowledge on what the work entails</p> <p>Is it ad libium (seen in EXPERIMENTAL SET UP) or ad libitum?? correction should be made (if necessary)</p> <p>In result and discussion spellings should be checked and corrected example : * lenght</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Moderately okay	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Discussion did not speak well of the result obtained neither did it reflect well on the title of the work rather was majorly discussed based on other authors work done on toxicity effects of some chemicals and likewise, dwelled more on the relevance and essence of haematological parameters analysed instead of discussion on the relevance of result obtained.</p> <p>THEREFORE the author is advised to reduce such explanations and discuss relevantly, the result obtained from the work as it relates to the title.</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:	Onuoha Chikaodiri Happiness
Department, University & Country	Institute of Agricultural Research & Training, Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria