

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_105703
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the Hepato-toxic Potential of Green Tea (<i>Camellia sinensis</i>) in 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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/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 highly important for scientific community. Especially for such areas/topics of higher discrepancies it will have a critical contribution.</p> <p>Yes, it is suitable. However, rather than saying '...Hepato-Toxic Potential', what if the title is modified to 'Evaluation of the aqueous extract of Green Tea (<i>Camellia sinensis</i>) on liver biomarkers and liver histology in Wistar Rats.'?</p> <p>Yes, it is comprehensive. It is line with the recommended (by me) title.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes. However, as there are findings of opposite result with this study, it needs to be presented in more comprehensive manner to support the findings of the study.</p> <p>Except few, more references are recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes. But it needs modifications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Generally, the manuscript is scientifically correct and it sound. It is better to modify the title as I have recommended. Because it is known that there are many studies showing hepatoprotective activities of the plant, unique findings of the present study needs to be discussed more in detail.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gudeta Duga Geresu
Department, University & Country	Ambo University, Ethiopia