

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJGH_96813
Title of the Manuscript:	Species differences on Intestinal CYP Expression
Type of the Article	Review 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://journalirjgh.com/index.php/IRJGH/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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. The manuscript is important for scientific community knowing that the CYP450 enzyme family is most responsible for the biotransformation of endobiotic and exobiotic. So, the aim of the present review is to gather current knowledge on intestinal Cytochrome P450 enzyme expressions in different species including humans. The paper is well structured and includes a series of well-argued sections with the literature data. 2. Yes, the title of the abstract is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The text is clear and easy to read. 6. The list of references is relatively recently.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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:	Dumitru Gabriela
Department, University & Country	Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania