

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Hepatology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Original Manuscript_AJRRHE_118130</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluation of the Antioxidant Activities of Zinc, Selenium and Vitamin B12 on Isoniazid and Rifampicin induced liver damage in mice</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalajrrhe.com/index.php/AJRRHE/editorial-policy> )

**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. <b>Antioxidant potentials of Zinc, Selenium, and Vitamin B12 in liver damage from Isoniazid and Rifampicin were studied with 25 Swiss mice. The study was conducted, and the result was analysed with error bar diagrams. So, the manuscript is important in the scientific community.</b></p> <p>2. <b>YES</b></p> <p>3. <b>Study Design:</b> part should be better.</p> <p>4. <b>YES</b></p> <p>5. <b>YES</b></p> <p>6. <b>YES</b></p> <p>.....</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>1. Referencing should be appropriately checked.</p> <p>2. The "P" is used in the abstract. What is P? It should be mentioned clearly.</p> <p>3. It would be better if the ANOVA table is given in the article with P values</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Goutam Mandal</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bankura Zilla Saradamani Mahila Mahavidyapith, India</b>