



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

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

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	This study aimed to investigate the nutritional effects of drinking a folk medicine, <i>Terminalia littoralis</i> decoction. The protein and amino acids, as well as the other nutrients were evaluated. The authors claimed that the decoction significantly increased growth rate, nutrient adequacy, digestion and assimilation of feeds. It is an interesting and important study for the application of folk medicine.	
Specific comments:		
Title and abstract	Fare	
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	1. Authors describe lot of information about <i>Terminalia capatta</i> in this section, but not <i>Terminalia littoralis</i> . Authors may apply more information and research about this plant.	
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	More reference about <i>Terminalia littoralis</i> should be cited, if available.	
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)	1. The decoction was made in an aluminium pot. It may interact with the constituents of <i>Terminalia littoralis</i> . Authors should exclude it. 2. The ethnic of animal study must be announced here, or please add the number of protocol of Affidavit of Approval of Animal Use Protocol for this study.	
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	1. At the beginning of study, rat weight ranged from 42 to 75. The variation of the weight was large, so it may affect the results growth rates and fluid intake. Authors have to explain it. 2. In addition, fluid intake was higher in experiment group and authors explained it may due to quench of the thirst. Why the rats drank <i>Terminalia littoralis</i> decoction was thirsty? It may be a factor to cause the difference between the two groups. 3. Authors claimed "It also meant that decocting the leaves destroyed or reduced the antinutritional factors contained in them." Any evidence or result directly improved this point? In addition, animals drank the decoction for 35 days, and the decoction may cause toxic effect after long term intake. Authors cannot neglect it.	



SDI Review Form 1.5

Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No.	
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	Fare	
References	1. More reference about <i>Terminalia littoralis</i> should be cited, if available. 2. <i>More reference of recent 2 years shouldcited.</i>	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer