



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJPR_7667
Title of the Manuscript:	Hepatotoxicity of Ethanol Extract of Adenium obesum Stem Bark in 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://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 <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The Work is perfect but nevertheless we must review some comments to give it its true value:</p> <p>The form of the abstract and references What is the reason for the choice of dose? Given that some authors indicates that ID50 is 116.62 mgkg-1 , therefore lower than the dose described in your work.</p> <p>It should be noted the route of administration and how much water was used to diluted?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>On the summary must reformulate the objective of the work: you said that it is a medicinal plant and at the same time very powerful poison arrows, knowing that administer by wane is lower than the dose of therapeutic purposes.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Change some term as: sample bottles as they say sample tube (universally).</p>	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer