

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_97233
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON GC-MS PROFILES AND EFFECT OF ETHANOLIC EXTRACTS OF STEM-BARK AND LEAVES OF Daniellia oliveri ON CEREBRAL SODIUM PUMP AND THIOLS STATUS IN FENTON REACTION TREATED RAT ORGANS In-vitro.
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://journalajrb.com/index.php/AJRB/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	It is good study but to be acceptable ,, there are Minor corrections : 1- There are some spelling errors ((the medicial usage = the medicinal usage)) in Abstract -last 2 lines 2- Also in ((experimental part : Male adult wistar rats = Male adult Wister rats)) 3- Also in ((preparation of tissue : anaesthetised = anaesthetized)) 4- Figure (5) needs to more clarification for its results 5- Table(1) also needs clarification 6- I accepted paper after Minor Corrections	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Needs to check ,, it is not good	
Optional/General comments	Minor corrections	

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:	Sarah Mohammed Abed
Department, University & Country	Iraq