



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMMR_16224
Title of the Manuscript:	Toxicity of Sodium arsenite and Cyclophosphamide in Rats: Protective Effects of Aqueous Extract of Adansonia digitata L Fruit Pulp.
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	The manuscript aimed to evaluate the protective effects of aqueous extract of <i>Adansonia digitata</i> L fruit pulp (AEFAD) in rats fed sodium arsenite rich diet and rats administred intraperitoneally with cyclophosphamide. Among the effects studied is the hepatoprotective activity of AEFAD considering that cyclophosphamide has already been reported to be cytotoxic. Low levels of GGT, AST and ALT are normally found in the blood. When liver is diseased or damaged, additional GGT, AST and ALT are released into the bloodstream. Logically, the authors performed a positive control (Group K) – rats administred intraperitoneally with	Sodium arsenite was administered orally to the rats (i.e by intubation) and not mixed with the diet. Groups B and C are the positive controls for sodium arsenite (SA) and cyclophosphamide (CP) respectively, groups J and K were given SA and CP for 14 days and left with feed and water only for another 14 days to observe for possible natural recovery.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	cyclophosphamide followed by a normal diet (14 days). In spite of this normal diet period prescribed, they did not observe high levels of GGT, AST and ALT (L.167) considering that it was observed severe periportal fibroplasia and cellular infiltration (L.147) in this group. In addition, it is very curious that group K showed ALT and AST levels lower than the control group (75.16 against 225.00). Is it possible? Thus, I could not observe consistent and coherent results. In addition, when we compare the positive control with treated groups, can we still say that there was hepatoprotective activity? <i>Minor comments</i> -L. 64 → “Group J and K received SA and CP respectively for 14 days and normal diet for another 14 days.” What was the concentration	There is elevated GGT 26.05 ± 0.57 against 4.63 ± 0.40 and ALT 42.10 ± 8.98 as against 25.65 ± 1.58 in group K (i.e Table 1) when compared with the negative control. In Table 1, there is an anomaly observed in the AST values but ALT values are consistent, which support the liver histological analysis. The reduction in the values of GGT and AST for group J is not supported by ALT value and histological analysis. Comparing the positive control with the treated groups, looking at the GGT values, supported by the histological analysis, we can say there is hepatoprotective activity which would have been more pronounced if the experimental period is extended.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of SA and CP used? -L. 156 – GGT → Spell out each abbreviation the first time it is used.-L. 168 – Please, replace $P=.05$ by $P<.05$. -Conclusion: The authors did not conclude anything at all about clastogenicity. Clastogenicity was listed as general objective (L.5). -Introduction: The authors performed various discussions (L.208) and conclusions (L.343) about the antioxidant activity. However, this effect was not listed as general objective (L.5), as well as it is not grounded in introduction section.	The concentration of SA and CP are 2.5mg/kg and 10mg/kg body weight respectively. This was initially spelt out in the manuscript L.57-60 under experimental protocol. $P=.05$ have now been replaced with $P<0.05$ $P=.05$ was initially indicated due to the information provided in the general guideline for authors under the guideline for reporting P values, where it is stated that correct expression is $P=.05$. Conclusion about clastogenicity have now been included. L. 344 I have now cited literature on the antioxidant activity of the pulp in the introduction section. See L.28, 29
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		