

Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_120191
Title of the Manuscript:	SEQUENTIAL ADMINISTRATION OF FEBUXOSTAT, AMLODIPINE AND VITAMIN E ATTENUATE OXIDATIVE STRESS AND IMPROVE SPERMATOGENESIS IN TESTICULAR ISCHEMIA-REPERFUSION INJURY IN WISTAR RATS.
Type of the Article	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://journalijbcr.com/index.php/IJBCRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.8

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)	Yes, it has an impact to the scientific community because multiple combination of drugs has been used in this study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Abstract – This to be written in concise manner. The authors have well performed about this study but recommended to simplify the abstract as possible. Example: The authors can mention the details by mentioning the objective, methods, results, conclusion as individual subtitles in the abstract itself. Recommended to provide the graphical abstract. It was not the requirement of journal as per the guidelines. But the study has been done with multiple drugs which has the significant outputs.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections need to be restructured to appropriately mention the objective of this study. Introduction – The objective of this study done by the authors are greatly appreciated. The authors were not highlighted novelty of this study, so it recommended to highlight the novelty with few additional insights when compared to the literature. Drugs & Reagents – Mention the details of assay, purity, retest period and where it has been stored prior to the study. Tables: There is no tabulated values for this study performed. Recommended to include in the manuscript. Limitation – To be explained prior to the conclusion. The study distinguishes the finer experimental design with less sample size, the biological variability shall be reduced in the larger sample size only. Conclusion – I am unable to find the conclusion of the study performed by the authors. Highly recommended to incorporate the conclusion part.	
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? (Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)	Yes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	References – Recommended to follow as per the journal guidelines for formatting the cited articles.	

Review Form 1.8

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	None	
Optional/General comments	None	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	Ethical approval was sought and given prior the experiment.

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Balaji Nagarajan
Department, University & Country	United States of America