

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_84163
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF AQUEOUS EXTRACT OF THE AERIAL PARTS OF LEONURUS CARDIACA ON CISPLATIN-INDUCED HEPATO-RENAL DAMAGE IN WISTAR ALBINO 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:

(<https://www.journaljalsi.com/index.php/JALSI/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The gap of the research that the author is addressing should be brought out well.</p> <p>The objectives/ aim should be well addressed and how they have been achieved should also come out well in the study</p> <p>Check the overall punctuation, spacing and grammatical errors</p> <p>The methodology given should give reproducible results. Give detailed methodology on what was done in the study</p> <p>The work should be well referenced.</p> <p>The references should be through revised</p> <p>All figures should be mentioned in the discussion</p>	<p>Done as required sir. Gaps in literature have been added and the objectives of the work has been stated</p>
Minor REVISION comments		<p>Done. The scientific name of the plant has been italicized and highlighted yellow as requested'</p> <p>For my experimental design, there is no other way it can be written without stating the total number of albino rats used as well as their weight even though they have been previously mention either in the abstract or anywhere in the work.</p>
Optional/General comments		<p>For my experimental design, there is no other way it can be written without stating the total number of albino rats used as well as their weight even though they have been previously mention either in the abstract or anywhere in the work.</p> <p>In interpretation of data subjected to statistical analysis, treated groups are best compared with normal and negative control values using significantly different from normal or negative control. Or significant increases was observed in the treated group at $p < 0.05$ when compared to normal or negative control.</p>

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	<p>No sir. Rather, ethical approval certificate was issued to research after thorough examination on the contents of the work by the University of Port Harcourt Ethical Commitee</p>