

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJGH_78196
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of 2, 2-dichlorovinyl dimethyl phosphate (Sniper) induced hepatotoxicity and oxidative stress in New Zealand white rabbits
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://journalirjgh.com/index.php/IRJGH/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>1. In abstract - Methodology: Thirty six (36) male New Zealand white rabbits weighing approximately 1.0mg/kg were used for the study. Q: Rabbit body weight is 1.0 kg not mg/kg</p> <p>2. Chronic term used in Article Q: Chronic is the word used for studies of 1 to 2 years. 90 days can be considered as sub chronic, 30 days and 60 days considered as repeated dose not chronic.</p> <p>3. For the chronic oral study, 10% of the LD50 dose which is 0.005mg/kg dose of sniper, mixed with 1.0ml of distilled water was administered orally to the rabbits daily for the stipulated period of 0-30, 0-60 and 0-90 days. Q: how the 0.005 mg/kg dose prepared, in the above lines clarity missing, as there will be different body weights, how it is mixed with 1 mL and given commonly</p> <p>4. Whilst, for the chronic inhalation study, 10% of the LD50 dose of sniper which is equivalent to 0.05mg/m3 dose of sniper was mixed with 1.0ml of distilled water, sprayed in the closed cages. Q: based on the above paragraph, can it be considered whole body exposure, how the actual concentration determined in inhalation route</p> <p>5. Laboratory investigation of parameters Q: In this section, principle of enzyme estimation was written which is not required, it can be written method used broadly by giving reference of the method.</p> <p>6. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Q: only graphical representation was given. Values need to be given which is very critical. Results to be given as values followed by graphical representation. Histopathology lesions were not written separately what the lesions are exactly observed.</p> <p>7. It was observed that upon continuous administration chronic toxicity observed. But in introduction it was discussed regarding suicides which are acute exposure. Reason for choosing 10% of LD50 is required based on above statements. Clinical signs or mortality observed during treatment were not written in the article.</p> <p>8. Conclusion Q: In conclusion it was declared as test item causing hepatotoxicity, but reversibility was not seen after stopping the treatment. As liver can regenerate by itself, the lesions observed may heal within stipulated time.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. In abstract Study design: This is an experimental study. Q: Instead of writing above sentence, experimental design can be written briefly.</p> <p>2. LD50 (details not included) Q: It has to be included, and along with this reported NOEL/NOAEL (no observed effect level/no observed adverse effect level) as per published literature has to be mentioned.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>1. ml or l can be written as mL or L</p> <p>2. There are spacing and typographical errors (eg: mls instead of mL).</p> <p>3. Some sentences are to be reframed (eg: In the liver, dichlorvos causes ultrastructural, biochemical, metabolic and mitochondrial damage which results to changes in the hepatic biomarkers such as serum ALT, AST, ALP and bilirubin levels as observed in this present study agrees with the findings of [12] who observed increase in the liver function parameters of rats that were exposed to repeated doses of organophosphorus pesticides.)</p> <p>4. appropriate ethics committee Can ethics committee name be written</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Satyavani Godavarthi
Department, University & Country	India