

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_128805
Title of the Manuscript:	Ameliorative Effect of Activated Charcoal on Tannic Acid Induced Hepatotoxicity in Rats
Type of the Article	

#### PART 1: 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)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The reported research work has significant relationship with the current environmental issue. Due to increase in the tannic acid level in the body it results in lot of health related problems. The proposed remedy for the liver necrosis is well known. However, the present work still needs to relate more parameters and results to confirm the usability of charcoal.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The word "Ameliorative" is not suitable in the title. Still lot of technical evidence are required to confirm the hepatotoxicity study. So it can be modified.	
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.	In the abstract, after induction with tannic acid, it is mentioned "treated with 0.01 mg/ml ....." those mentioned concentrations are of charcoal. But it was not clearly mentioned.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Thought the author is tried to find the effect of charcoal on the hepatotoxicity study, there are more information is needed in the methodology and experimentation part in the manuscript. The author could explain in brief about the methods used for determining the enzyme concentrations. Also, in most of the places, the units are not properly mentioned as like SI units. Lot of errors are there in the representation of the units in many data which may confuse the readers. The author can explain the reason behind in the selection of activated charcoal in better and the justification in selecting the three different concentrations of charcoal. There is no information is available that how much volume of charcoal is been used.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No the references are not sufficient and recent. The results and discussion is not done with the recently reported results. Most of the references and citations are not recent. It is better to refer recent articles for discussion.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language is fine. However, it could be still more comprehensive.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In general, the manuscript can have still more information regarding the experimentation part, discussion with recent reports and more clarity in the selection of charcoal and administration difficulty.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Mariaamalraj Samykannu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sethu Institute of Technology, India</b>