



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/IJBcRR/1867
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional effects of drinking Terminalia littoralis Seem. decoction in place of water on Wistar rats

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>Minor Revisions</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Page 3: There is a need to be realistic about the true potential and effects of herbal preparations. They clearly have the potential to improve health care if proven efficacious. However, it is a stretch to suggest that they reduce poverty. Reduction of poverty encompasses more than just improved health or transient financial savings realized from herbal preparations. Please consider the following instead of the current one.</p> <p>“Such medicines aid in the development of healthcare by increasing health coverage to the people (Elujoba <i>et al.</i>, 2005); thus, economically empowering herbalists and conserving funds for those who can prepare them at home”.</p> <p>Page 7: Still not addressed. This style of methods cross-referencing which is a hallmark of this particular paper promotes “reference-chasing” which is very tedious in the review process. More importantly, it makes the paper lack an identity of its own. The author can start with the following “briefly, the rats were.....”, and proceed from there.</p> <p>Results and discussion</p> <p>Page 10: The author means Table 3 in the revised version.</p> <p>Final comments</p> <p>Medicine claim: The author insists on the use of the word “medicine” for the decoction, but provides no single data to support that claim in this study. The word is clearly being used loosely and must be revised.</p> <p>The author's response to the optional/General comments in the initial review suggested that his choice is to present the data as a “nutritional effect” clearly due to the lack of therapeutic data. Thus reference to any medicinal effect or claim is undue in the current manuscript and must await further data.</p>	<p>The sentence was actually the words of Elujoba et al. (2005). It has been modified to reflect the current suggestions.</p> <p>Sentence has been modified.</p> <p>The computation was reflected in Table 4. Sentence has been up-dated to include Table 3.</p>