

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JOCAMR_123287 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evaluation of Hepato-protective activity of Bixa Orellana plant extract against hepatic injured Rodent Model |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

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

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|---|---|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>This article shows some novelty, so it can accept with few corrections.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>Yes suitable</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the abstract the authors says about 50 animals but in the manuscripts content stated as 45 animals check it 2. Group 1 is not highlighted in the abstract 3. Group 2-6 treated with CCL4 but the author not mention about group 2 what has given, group 3-6 what treatment has done etc are missing 4. Group 7 through 9 received varying doses The author can give the doses instead of low medium and high, and moreover the grammar has to check 5. Moreover in the method section of abstract the author forget to mention what are the parameters going to measure? 6. In the results of abstract, author can give doses concentration instead of stating low, medium and high. | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>Yes its appropriate</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sounds GOOD</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> | <p>The authors has to follow the instructions to author guidelines according the Journal requirements Typo graphical errors has be noticed on the Reference no : 3, 11, 17 and 25</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Introduction section;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In the introduction section the H₂O₂ and O₂ can write as H₂O₂ and O₂ The citation number was bold and unbold was noticed in the manuscript. Make it uniform throughout the scripts; follow the author's guidelines as per the journal requirements. <p>Materials and Methods Section:</p> <p>Title 2.1. Plant collection.....</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How much quantity of the powder was taken for the extraction? What is the technique used for the extraction processes eg cold maceration or Soxhlet extraction, etc.. The author can mention the temperature and pressure used for the rotary evaporator Finally what is the percentage of yield after drying the crude extract? <p>Title 2.3. Experimental Animal.....</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Here mention 45 male rats but in the abstract stated that 50 Swiss Albino rats used. The title 2.3 also involved about animal grouping, the author can give grouping in a detail manner. <p>Title 2.4. Animal Model.....</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Here also 45 rats divided into 9 groups. And moreover each group consists of 5 animals. In a research mostly n=6 animals will be chosen. How come this researcher used only 5 animals for each group? Did the author face any mortality? What was the mortality rate? The researchers state that..... Daily observations were conducted during the mating season..... What is purpose of this line? Is this is needed for the study. Moreover if mating is done he animals will be pregnant, it may inter the research. . <p>Title 2.5. Dose selection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The author stated that..... A single oral dose of CCl₄ mixed with olive oil in a 1:1 ratio (3 ml/kg of rat body weight) induced liver damage in all groups except the normal control group..... But in the tables 1,2 and 3 it was noticed that Group 7, 8, 9 not given CCL₄. Check it The author stated thatBixa Orellana extracts were administered orally in various doses to the animals with hepatic injury as a post-treatment. The author can highlight the doses concentration. <p>Result Section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Table 2, 3 and 4 the footnote is missing. SGOT stated that statistically significant in the 4.1.2 SGOT paragraph, but it was not captured in the table 2? The author compares the result with only disease control group, why not with other groups? Table 4 the creatinine data; CCl₄ + BO₃₀₀ and CCl₄ + BO₆₀₀ shows significant, but in the 4.2.1 Creatinine Level Analysis Paragraph Creatinine levels revealed a significant decrease (p<0.05) in both medium and high doses when compared to the diseased control group..... At the same time in the last two lines of the same paragraph stated that..... Indicates that the low and medium dosages had a significant impact on creatinine levels, differentiating them from the control group with disease. The authors has to check it Table 4: the Total cholesterol of Group 5 shows good effort compare to Group 6 by seeing the data. But the author highlighted only group 6 is significant. Please check the statistics <p>Discussion section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4.2.1 Creatinine Level Analysis paragraph has to rephrase <p>Conclusion section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Check the font size of last two lines <p>Finally the manuscript should draft more scientific manner.</p> | |

Review Form 3

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <i>(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)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Varatharajan Rajavel |
| Department, University & Country | AIMST University, Semeling Campus, Malaysia |