

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IRJGH_106810</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluation of Methanol Extract of Napoleona imperialis Seeds on Some Biochemical Indices, Fertility status and Organs of Albino Rats</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- Yes, this manuscript has some importance to the fields of pharmacognosy and toxicology as it tries to evaluate the toxic effect of <i>Napoleona imperialis</i> seeds on several parameters of lab rats.</p> <p>2- Yes, the title looks appropriate.</p> <p>3- Yes, the abstract is comprehensive but I recommend to mention the doses of seeds extract used in treatment groups.</p> <p>4- Yes, the article is structured In the right way.</p> <p>5- Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct but authors should mention the calculated p-value for each biochemical parameter in the results.</p> <p>6- Yes, the used references are sufficient but not recent. Moreover, the used references are not sequential.</p> <p>7- Authors are advised to add “albino rats” to the keywords.</p> <p>8- In materials and methods, I am wondering how the percentage yield of the extract was calculated?</p> <p>9- In materials and methods, I am wondering if authors used rats or mice?</p> <p>10- In materials and methods, how the authors were able to divide 4 mice into three groups in phase 2 of toxicity test?</p> <p>11- Authors mention that LD50 calculation was not possible because no animals died in toxicity test but in discussion, they said the dose of 5000 mg/kg has led to death of one mouse. How that is possible?</p> <p>12- Authors didn't mention that this project was approved by ethical committee.</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>Writing quality need to be improved and there are many mistakes in punctuations like extra spaces.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

## Review Form 1.7

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Hasanain Abdulhameed Odhar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al-Zahrawi University College, Iraq</b>