



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_58508
Title of the Manuscript:	Bioactive constituents and biochemical assessment of Argemone mexicana linn and Urtica dioica leaf extracts using male albino rat
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/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	<p>It will be "Urtica dioica", not "Urtica dioica" and will be written in italics. It should be corrected in the entire text.</p> <p>It will be "Argemone mexicana linn", not "Argemone mexicanna lin" and will be written in italics. It should be corrected in the entire text.</p> <p>Introduction is very superficially written. An adequate reference screening should be made about the two plants that are the subject of the study and should be written in this section.</p> <p>No information was found as to whether the ethics committee approval was received.</p> <p>Who collected the plants, when, and which herbarium plants are stored, what is the herbarium number?</p> <p>In which way were plant extracts given to rats (per oral, intra peritoneal, etc.)?</p> <p>It should be stated which post hoc tests are used in statistical analysis.</p> <p>The newest reference is from 2014. A good reference scan should be made and the most recent references should also be added to the article.</p>	Comment accepted and considered
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	