

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_77399
Title of the Manuscript:	HISTOLOGICAL AND HEAMATOLOICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECT OF HEINSIA CRINATA EXTRACT ON DICHLORVOS (DDVP) INDUCED TOXICITY IN ADULT WISTAR RATS
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p><i>This paper presents a study on evaluating the histochemical and hematological effect of Hencia crinata extract on dichlorvos-induced toxicity (DDVP) on the liver of Wistar rats. Generally, the title and abstract are appropriate for the purpose and content. The research itself is meaningful, and the results are of good value to research in the field. However, many concerns were noted:</i></p> <p>Major points</p> <p><i>1. The level of English is not good enough in many places and some sentences have poor grammar construction. I strongly recommend the use of a professional proof reading and editing service for a resubmitted manuscript.</i></p> <p><i>2. Authors are advised to take a serious look at the recent (2019-2021) literature for the medical application of heinsia crinite.</i></p> <p><i>3. The result section needs to be fully revised due to the lack of descriptive paragraphs explaining the obtained data.</i></p> <p><i>4. The discussion section currently repeat experimental summaries and then focus on what other researchers have done. Both are fine to include, but missing is the discussion of where the author's interpretation adds to the literature and this needs adding.</i></p> <p>Specific Comments</p> <p><i>5. A sentence explaining why the authors chose 35mg/kg of dichlorvos, 200g/kg and 500mg/kg of the Heinsia crinita extract, these concentrations should be supported by references.</i></p> <p><i>6. The line spacing in the text is sometimes inconsistent in the manuscript. This needs to be corrected.</i></p> <p><i>7. Authors must provide a statement confirming that they have obtained ethical approval from their institution along with the approval number.</i></p> <p><i>8. All tables and figures should be self-explanatory. Please add legends clearly explain the letters and abbreviations to the all captions.</i></p> <p><i>9. Please use a fixed font size in the tables.</i></p> <p><i>10. The unit size (g, mg/kg, etc) should be spaced from the numbers.</i></p>	All reviewer concerns have is noted and will be effected in the revised manuscript
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>	