

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_87079
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Irvingia Grandifolia on the Plasma Concentration of Urea, Creatinine and White Blood Cells Count (Total & Differential) in Normal Rabbits.
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://journalijbcr.com/index.php/IJBCRR/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	<p>The author's references under the 'Introduction' are very obsolete. The author should include latest references that are in tandem to the same information that was of intent or already established.</p> <p>The author gave a well detailed definition of parameters under the literature review but did not include mathematical expressions of Acute toxicity formulae as well as LD50.</p> <p>Experimental Design or Study design of the assay were not properly spelt out, again I expected to see the calculation of the Acute toxicity or a pilot of LD50 for Irvinga granifolia. For instance,</p> <p>Group 1: Normal Control (Given the plant and food only) Group 2: Treated Control (Induced and treated with plant extract and food) Group 3: Treated Control with 100mg/ b.wt of plant extract, which type of extract, aqueous? Etc??</p> <p>(That would give a clearer picture of the dosage administered.)</p> <p>Lastly, The author talked about the plant extract being antidiabetic but did not state how the rabbits were induced and treated. what bred of white rabbits were used? References were not stated for Intubation methods, Berthelot's method and Jaffe's method.</p> <p>Generally, it was an interesting research.</p>	Revised
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Statistical level of significance should be well explained on each result explanation with regards to laboratory reference limits with the effect of the plant on the organs explained On what level of significance was the result established?.	Noted
<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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	