

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_81265
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF DIFFERENT LOCAL SPICES ON HEPATIC FUNCTIONS IN MALE MICE EXPOSED TO LAMBDA-CYHALOTHRIN
Type of the Article	Original 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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.6

### PART 1: Review Comments

	<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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>It was not clear the choice of doses administered, nor how the preparation of the molecules under study was carried out, ensuring that their properties remained the same after joining.</p> <p>The work reports that it followed the protocols of an ethics committee, but does not present its registration number or any letter authorizing the execution of the study with the animals.</p> <p>The results did not present the data on the weight of the organs, but it is reported in the discussion and methodology, leaving the reader confused, as he did not present data, he reports that the test was done and discusses its importance. Review this detail and add what is missing.</p> <p>Since the study is about a chronic toxicological evaluation, it would be important to report the hematological data and the behavior of the groups after the administration of the molecules.</p> <p>The work does not have an important essay that can enhance the research, even though this is not the main objective, but it can bring significant data that is the histology of the liver and other organs, being able to report if there has been, microscopically, cellular damage in the tissue, its intensity, whether it is reversible or not, it may or may not generate more complex pathologies, as well as activating or not the immune system and at what cellular level.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Did the use of male animals have any protocol that was more representative to answer the biological question of the trial? Why did the authors not perform females where the hormones could present perhaps more complex results, as they have a differential hormonal system than males?</p> <p>As this is a test with a widely used molecule and based on the tests presented, what the authors suggest for its replacement, which may not harm the organism and have the same properties in the application of those found on the market, as well as if this molecule it has conditions to be produced on an industrial scale without causing environmental impacts.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>What data reported in the literature was chosen to use the dosages, time and route of administration in the animal?</p> <p>Does this study have in vitro test data that will corroborate the effectiveness of the toxicological evaluation?</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**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><i>Maria De Sousa Brito Neta</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Universidade De Brasilia-UNB, Brazil</i></b>