

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJANR_87887
Title of the Manuscript:	MITIGATION OF ALLOXAN INDUCED RENAL DYSFUNCTION BY HYDROETHANOLIC EXTRACT OF FLEURYA AESTUANS IN WISTAR RATS
Type of the 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

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<div><div><div>1. Remove the mitigation in the title and re-write, because you are not sure that all the animal has renal dysfunction after the induction of diabetes. Or maybe the extract causes the renal dysfunction.</div><div>2. Remove, should be captured in your experimental design Abstract is writing in the format below</div><div>- Aim of the research (in your case is correct)</div><div>- Objectives (in your case is renal function test, histological studies and acute toxicity study)</div><div>- Result (briefly explain all your result)</div><div>- Conclusion(briefly)</div><div>3. Explain all the procedure in detail as mentioned.</div><div>4. You did not briefly explain the result from the plate as you did for table 1.</div><div>5. <b>There are statements that needs citations cite them accordingly,</b></div><div>6. You just explain the result; you did not discuss. You have to compare your results with other relevant research's and see whether they are the same or not, and give reason on what make makes them so based on literature and cite appropriately.</div><div>7. Re-write your conclusion. One line is too small, at least 3-4 lines</div></div></div> <div>All the necessary corrections were done as indicated</div>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<div>Make corrections to all the places highlighted and re-write were necessary as mentioned. Make sure all the tables, plates and charts are in accordance with guidelines. Italicise were necessary and the references should be in accordance with guidelines</div>	<div>Noted</div>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<div>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</div>	