

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJANR_78085
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of chronic toxicological effects of 2, 2-dichlorovinyl dimethyl phosphate (Sniper) on the kidneys of New Zealand white rabbits
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://www.journalijanr.com/index.php/IJANR/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><b>There are major issues and corrections in the manuscript beyond pasted in the provided box. The manuscript should be totally revised.</b></p> <p><b>General Comments:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The toxic effect of Dichlorvos has already been investigated and many literatures are available online some of which are study by Ajiboso et al. (2012) with DOI: 10.5829/idosi.abr.2012.6.4.6514 titled "Sub Chronic Inhalation Toxicity Studies of 2,2-Dichlorovinyl Dimethyl Phosphate (DDVP) in Albino Rats". Ipinmoroti et al. (2017) titled "Histopathological Effects of 2,2-Dichlorovinyl Dimethyl Phosphate (DDVP) on Coptodon Zillii (GERVAIS, 1848) Juveniles". John et al. (2019) titled "Chronic inhalation of 2,2dichlorovinyl dimethyl phosphate (DDVP) induces organ pathology in the adult albino rats". What is the rational for conducting this study?</li><li>2. The nephrotoxic effect of dichlorvos has already been reported and dichlorvos has been established as a standard model for inducing nephrotoxicity in animals as in reference to the study available online by Edna et al. (2020) with DOI: 10.9734/JAMPS/2020/v22i630175 titled "Evaluation of Protective Properties of Elaeis oleifera Fruit Extract on Renal Parameters of Dichlorvos-Induced Nephrotoxicity in Albino Rats" and Olatunde et al. (2014) titled "Renal Corpuscles Were Protected From Dichlorvos - Induced Morphological Alterations in Rats by Antioxidant Vitamins". Why conducting this study?</li><li>3. In the introduction section (1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, line 7; 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, line 1-11), the authors stated and cited the literature on the toxic effect of dichlorvos and mechanism of its toxicity which indicated that the toxicity study of dichlorvos has already been done. Therefore, why conducting this study and even sent it for publication since it has already being done.</li><li>4. Many sentences and statements are not cited. The entire manuscript should be</li></ol>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>subjected to plagiarism check.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>5. There are grammatical errors in the manuscript including sentence breaks, inappropriate words, spelling error and inappropriate phrases. The entire manuscript need to be subjected to grammatical check.</li><li>6. No details information of the author and co-authors written.</li><li>7. There is no organization in all the sections especially materials and methods and the result section. The sections should be organized based the standard and the format of the journal.</li><li>8. In the entire manuscript, the letter p in P&lt;0.05 should be lower case and italicized. The <i>p</i>&lt;0.05 should be placed after the word 'significant'</li><li>9. The manuscript should be rewrite on the standard, journal's format and the journal's policy.</li></ol> <p><b>Title</b> Rewrite the title. Make it more relevant and precise to the objective of the study.</p> <p><b>Abstract</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <b>Background or introduction</b> is missing.</li><li>2. <b>Aim:</b> The first letter (t) should be capitalized</li><li>3. <b>Study Design:</b> According to the standard this is not part of the abstract, hence should be removed.</li><li>4. <b>Place and Duration:</b> This is not in line with the standard. Please remove it.</li><li>5. Based on the standard, the abstract should consists only five contents; background or introduction, aim, methodology or materials and methods, result and conclusion.</li><li>6. <b>Methodology:</b> The methodology should be summarized concisely to at most half of its line. There is no need for the statement(s)/sentence(s) in line 2 – 3 and 12 – 18.</li></ol>	
--	--	--

	<p>The statement in the line 12 – 18 can be summarized as <b>'The animals were sacrificed; blood sample and kidney tissues were prepared for biochemical analysis and histopathological examination, respectively'</b>. In line 8 what do the authors mean by "Whilst"?</p> <p>7. <b>Result:</b> The letter p in <math>P &lt; 0.05</math> should be lower case and italicized. The <math>p &lt; 0.05</math> should be placed after the word 'significant'. There are grammatical errors and inappropriate words used. Please rephrase.</p> <p>8. <b>Conclusion:</b> Please rephrase the conclusion statement based on aim of the study and the result obtained.</p> <p>9. There are many grammatical errors and inappropriate used of words in the entire abstract.</p> <p><b>Keywords</b></p> <p>What do you mean by chronic toxicological effect? Why not the word 'toxicity'? Please more relevant and appropriate words should be listed.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>1. The statement(s)/sentence(s) in the first paragraph (line 13 – 14, 16 – 17), second paragraph (line 1 – 2) and the third paragraph (line 1 – 2, 6 – 7, 11 – 12) should be cited.</p> <p>2. There are many grammatical errors, sentence breaks and inappropriate used of words. Please rephrase.</p> <p><b>Materials and Methods</b></p> <p>1. Section 2.1: There repeated relevant statements (line 4 and 6) and should be removed.</p> <p>2. The authors stated that the animals were treated according to guideline for cure and use of animals but did mention ethical reference number. Please mention the</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.6

	<p>reference number or removed.</p> <p>3. <b>Section 2.2:</b> According to the standard the paragraph should not be begin with numeral. Please in word or rephrase. There is no need for the statement in line 1 – 3.</p> <p>4. <b>Section 2.3:</b> Why the authors presented the experimental design in tabular form? This is not in line with the standard for the published article. Confusion! How many control groups do you have? Does each treatment group has a unique control group? Do the control groups received different treatment? If not why having control for each treatment group? This is not in line with the standard.</p> <p>5. <b>Section 2.4:</b> The subsections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 should be stated in headings titled chronic oral and inhalation toxicity study. In subsection 2.4.2 the authors are just stating about the place the experiment conducted which is not in line with the standard. The methods used for the analysis of each biochemical parameter should be stated. The subsections 2.4.2.1, 2.4.2.2 2.4.2.3, 2.4.2.4 and 2.4.2.5 are not in line with the standard for publish research article. The subsections should be removed. Histopathological examination is different study, hence should be on a separate different subsection not 2.4.2.6.</p> <p>6. <b>Section 2.4:</b> What do the authors mean by “The mean <math>\pm</math> standard deviation was determined”? Do the authors mean the data or results are presented as mean <math>\pm</math> standard deviation? What do you mean by “one way analysis of variance (ANOVA)”? Do you mean data were analyzed by one way analysis of variance (ANOVA)? There are grammatical errors. The section should be rewrite.</p> <p><b>Result</b></p> <p>1. The results are not clearly explained and no organization in the results presentation. The results should be presented in a standard format.</p> <p>2. Each figure should be placed immediately after its respective notes (explanation).</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.6

	<p>3. Title of each figure should be written below the figure labeled appropriately. The title of each figure should be rephrased. The title at the top of each chart/figure should be removed.</p> <p>4. What do the authors mean by Na, K, Cl, Cr, CRP and KIM on the y-axis of the figure? Do you mean concentration of sodium, [Na]? This is not in line with the standard. The y-axis should be titled clearly and appropriately with unit. Please rephrase the title of the y-axis of the figures.</p> <p>5. The word 'groups' on the x-axis of the chart/figure should be in single form 'group'</p> <p>6. All the plates for the histopathological examination should be arranged in a single figure labeled appropriately, using arrow on the plates and key in the footnote.</p> <p>7. The statistical significant should be indicated clearly and appropriately among the respective groups.</p> <p>8. There are many grammatical errors, sentence breaks and phrases. The whole section should be rewrite</p> <p>9. For all the figures here is no footnote written for description of the figure, groups, abbreviations and statistical comparison.</p> <p><b>Result</b></p> <p>1. In the first paragraph line 1 – 6, the authors are just stating about the experimental procedure performed. According to the standard no repetition of procedure in the result or discussion. Please remove it.</p> <p>2. The statement(s) in the second paragraph (line 6 – 7), third paragraph (line 7 – 9 and 12 – 14), fourth paragraph (line 1 – 3) fifth paragraph (line 7 – 8, 10 – 14, 16 – 22 and 24 – 29) should be cited.</p> <p>3. Confusion! There is no any table in the result section. But in the sixth paragraph line 1 – 2, the authors mentioned that "Effect of oral and inhalation routes of dichlorvos</p>	
--	--	--

**Review Form 1.6**

	<p>exposure on the rabbits kidney function parameters were compared as shown in table 1". Why are you describing result with and referring to the table in the methodology section. This is totally not in line with the standard.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>The conclusion should be rewrite based on the objective of the study and the results obtained.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Recommendation is missing.</p> <p><b>References</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The references list should be start on a separate page</li> <li>2. The references should be written based on the reference style the journal instructed.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reviewer's Recommendation</b></p> <p>The manuscript is not recommended for publication. It may be accepted after major corrections, declared issues and revised.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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><i>Ibrahim Abubakar</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Nigeria</i></b>