



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_12013
Title of the Manuscript:	BIOCHEMICAL CHANGES IN ALBINO RATS EXPOSED TO RICE HUSK DUSK AT ABAKALIKI RICE MILL INDUSTRIAL AREA.
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	This manuscript investigates the effect of inhalation on some biochemical parameters on rats exposed to the rice hush dust at the Abakaliki rice mill. The authors affirm as the rice husk dust inhalation result to certain level of toxicity to body. This work certainly presents good potential for publication, mainly due to the relevance of the results can be directly related to Abakaliki's workers. However I have a few points to be raised. (Introduction) Firstly, I suggest that the manuscript (especially the introduction) be rewrite using. While reading the introduction I realized that the introduction presents fragmented paragraphs that have no correlation between them. I believe that a restructuring taking into account this information will contribute to improve the final quality of work. As a suggestion finalize the introduction with the main objective. (Metodology) I could not find a description of the technique used for the preparation of histological slides. So, if the authors have not described, suggest that this information be added. (Results) The results have been little explored. Were only presented in tables / figures. In this topic I suggest that the authors add an objective description of the results, as was done in part in the discussion.	Introduction has been ammended Method of histological procedures undertaken to analyze our slide is now added. Objective description of the result is as well affected in the revision. The discussion is also modified to make the work better.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Another alternative would be to present results and discuss, if permitted formats by the editorial office. (Discussion) The authors presented a more descriptive thread which criticizes, with little scientific basis. I understand the importance and relevance of the study and believe with a better discussion of the results of the final quality of the product improves greatly.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I suggest grouping Plates 1 and 2 in a single figure, by specifying A and B, and add the information as legend. The same suggestion for Plates 3, 4 and 5.	The grouping has been taken care of in the effected corrections. I hope that is what the reviewer meant?
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I suggest to the authors if possible the ethical issues together with the results obtained by analysis of the serum of animals were presented the same biochemical tests in the serum of workers in this company. Taking care to select healthy controls and has no contact with the working environment. I believe that such analysis will greatly enhance the quality and reinforce even more the main objective of the study, concern for the welfare of the worker.	Further work is ongoing where we are trying to see if the workers will agree to donate their blood samples for analysis after some brief seminars. The problem is that people find it difficult to donate blood samples in this part of the world because of underdevelopment. This manuscript contains information on the result obtained from the laboratory animals only and no ethical issues are required for research with laboratory animals here. Hence, no ethical issues were involved.