

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_89198
Title of the Manuscript:	Duration dependent impact of aspartame and Sacoglottis gabonensis on the liver of swiss mice
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>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please align the heading on the left. Right alignment is not scientifically wrong but left alignment is a common accepted format for the manuscript. 2. Why is this study needed at all? What is the significance of using aspartame and Sacoglottis gabonensis? This needs to be mentioned in the abstract. 3. It is not clear from the abstract that the authors measured any oxidative stress marker in the manuscript to claim that Sacoglottis gabonensis has an antioxidant function. 4. Introduction started with neurodegeneration and then only liver enzyme were measured. This needs to be clarified. 5. Please mention the gender of the mice and the reason for selecting that gender over the other. 6. Authors repeated some of the lines in the method section from the abstract. These needs to be rewritten. 7. What does it mean by plain sample bottle in the blood collection method section? Was the blood with any type of anticoagulant or not? 8. Biochemical methods need to be described in detail. Only references will not be enough. 9. Endogenous and exogenous biomarkers are the vague terms. Why were these biomarkers selected? There was no rationale given for that. Please explain. 10. As there were 5 mice in each group, there should be standard deviation, or a standard error indicated in each data. Please mention that in each figure. 11. Why only liver was examined? Why not other tissues? This rationale needs to be included. 12. Please point "mitotic figures, binucleated cells, mitotic telophase and few necrotic cells" in the figures. And please quantity these claims in 5 mice in each group for all the figures. 13. Please maintain the font style in each figure legend. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Arpita Chatterjee
Department, University & Country	University of Nebraska Medical Center, USA