

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_120973</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Hepatoprotective Effects of Piperine on Thioacetamide-Induced Hepatotoxicity in Rats: A Lipid Profile Analysis</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>		
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>The title</b> reflects the main subject of the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p><b>In the abstract</b> - there is no complain. The abstract is well structured and summarise the work described in the manuscript, and keywords reflect the focus of the manuscript</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>Introduction</b> - cite of the references are not numerated. The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study, but from my point of view there is to much groups in the study, the same resoult and conclusion we will get that we exclude group III and V, and all study will be more understadiblle. ethodology</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p><b>Discussion:</b> The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. The findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature are stated in a clear and definite manner. The discussion is accurate. Figures, diagrams and tables are sufficient and of good quality. There is no study limitation in discussion chapter.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =</p>	<p><b>References:</b> citation was not adequately done in this manuscript, there is no numbers of manuscripts in the litetarure. Litherature is with the latest, important and authoritative references, and without self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references. The quality of manuscript organization and presentation is acceptable. The style, language and grammar need to go under native speaker check. Zagreb, July, 22,2024.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Mislav Rakić</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Croatia</b>