



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/IJBcRR/2098
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE HYPOLIPIDAEMIC EFFECT OF AQUEOUS EXTRACT OF PSIDIUM GUAJAVA LEAVES AND ASCORBIC ACID IN MALE RATS

General guideline: Reviewers are requested to follow these guidelines during review: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- Introduction *(Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)*
- 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)*
- 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?)*
- 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)*
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
COMPULSORY REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	1. The report of study is not new. Previous reports by various authors have demonstrated the hypolipidemic effect of guava extracts and vitamin C. E.g. Farinazzi-Machado et al. (2012). Effects of <i>Psidium guajava</i> on the metabolic profile of Wister rats. Journal of Medicinal Plants Research Vol. 6(18), pp. 3450-3454. However, study is addition to compedium of knowledge on the matter and further supports the folklore usage of the extracts of guava plants. 2. Also if authors set out to compare the hypolipidemic effect of vitamin C and extracts of guava leaves, it is expected that the vitamin C content of the extracts would have been determined. Attributing the observed activity to the presence of vitamin C is rather a speculation in the absence of information on vitamin c concentration in the extract used for study, substantive facts are required, noting that empirical evidence has clearly	Crude extract was used in the study. Hence, determination of the specific amount / concentration of vitamin C in the quava leaf extract was not part of the scope of the study. However, work aiming at determining the concentration of vitamin C and other phytochemicals in the species of quava leaf extract used in the study is in progress.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	demonstrated existence of variation in phyto-constituents which could be environmental or geographical dependent. 3. The statistical presentations are confusing. Authors should be more precise. 4. The figures do not have error bars. The y-axis is not labelled. The statistical differences were not indicated.	These have been corrected in description of the data presented in Table 1. These have been corrected. The error bars have been indicated in the figures, and y-axis labelled.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. The introduction was well thought out and study objective clearly stated. 2. The procedures used are explicitly explained. 3. Data partially supports discussion and conclusion. Some speculations made do not have supporting data in the study.	