

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_100184
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF AQUEOUS EXTRACT OF <i>Solanum aethiopicum</i> ON THE HAEMATOLOGICAL PROFILE AND BLOOD FILM OF WISTAR RAT
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.journalejnf.com/index.php/EJNFS/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. It tries to provide basis for the biosafety of <i>Solanum aethiopicum</i> as a blood booster.</p> <p>Should be modified to read 'ASSESSMENT OF AQUEOUS EXTRACT OF <i>Solanum aethiopicum</i> ON THE HAEMATOLOGICAL PROFILE OF WISTAR RAT'</p> <p>Not comprehensive. The specific methods used should be clearly stated and not generalized, as well as age, weight and sex of the Wistar rats. Values should be provided in the result section of the abstract. This is a scientific paper and not socio.</p> <p>Yes, they are appropriate.</p> <p>It is, however the result is not enough to justify the aim of the study. The manuscript provided only one result which is not justifiable enough.</p> <p>The references are recent and adequate enough.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is not suitable enough, it requires a major grammatical and editorial correction. Scientific communication is lacking.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. The result provided (only Table 1) is not enough to address the aim of the study.</p> <p>2. Further analyses is required and should be reported, including the Physicochemical analyses of the aqueous extract (quantitative and qualitative). This will reveal the phytochemicals present in the extract like saponin, tanins, etc. It will assist in the discussion.</p> <p>3. There should be result on the daily weight of the rats, since they were kept for upto 60 days during the course of the experiment.</p> <p>4. There should be a scientific basis for this time frame (60 days), since the rats might have already been over-weighed.</p> <p>5. Also, during this time frame, are there no readings taken? This should be taken into consideration.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Babayemi Olawale Oladejo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Technology, Nigeria</b>