



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJBcRR_6262
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Orlistat and herbal mixture extract on renal function and oxidative stress biomarkers in a rat model of high fat diet
Type of the 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 (if agreed with reviewer, corrects the manuscript and highlights that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	ABSTRACT In conclusion: "..... HFD and reduce feed intake, MDA level and decreased oxidative stress in renal tissues" clear, when MDA is an oxidative stress marker why both together? INTRODUCTION You have described only clinical and epidemiological studies, experimental justifications required for the estimated parameters. Nothing talked about the taken compounds, describe their properties and mode of action on oxidative stress with recent references. MATERIALS AND METHODS Diet: How the high fat diet has prepared? Describe dietary ingredients and preparation method. You said "herbal mixture" how did you treat the animals? By mixing extract in oil or separately. How you fixed the doses? The used methods are not clear, rewrite the method section. RESULTS Results section is too lengthy with many heading, it should be reduced up to 20% of the present length. Discussion It is too lengthy with heading, it should be brief and supportive to the present results. The conclusion is not clear, rewrite showing the rationale of the study	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comment	Not acceptable	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer