



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJBcRR_16081
Title of the Manuscript:	INVITRO ANTIBACTERIAL ACTIVITY AND INVIVO ACUTE TOXICOLOGICAL STUDIES OF NELSONIA CAMPESTRIS AQUEOUS LEAF EXTRACT
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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript has interesting results, especially because published studies with this plant are very rare. However, certain improvements in the manuscript are necessary: 1. Exact geographical location from which the plant specimens were collected should be clearly stated; 2. Who identified the plant? This should be clearly stated , too; 3. The Results section is composed only of tables and figures. They should be connected with suitable text, which will make the Results section seems as a whole thing; 4. ANOVA was used for statistical purposes, but no results are reported; besides, in order to use ANOVA, one must prove that the data are normally distributed by Kolgomorov Smirnov test. If the data are not normally distributed, the authors should perform Kruscal Wallace non-parametric ANOVA. 5. The authors should be careful in discussion of the observed results. Why is cholesterol in control group almost 10 mM/l? From the literature one may see that normal values in rats are about 2.5 mM/l. This should be explained, or not reported if it is artefact. 6. From the Fig1 it is not obvious that rats have anaemia. Why it is stated? 7. It is better not to said in the discussion that	1. Geographical location is stated 2. It has been stated too 3. A brief interpretation of the result has been done 4. ANOVA was used for data generated from all experimental procedure. The mean $\pm$SEM was calculated as stated in 2.8.5. In all cases triplicate results were used for statistical analyses. 5. Part of the objectives of the research is to check the effect of the extract on lipid profile (eg cholesterol). If the control group rats have cholesterol level as high as 10 mM/l , then it is only a reference for other groups. 6. It was not stated anywhere that the rats



SDI Review Form 1.6

	decreased concentration of protein in blood is due to decreased synthesis in the liver, because this effect could not be seen for only 24 hours, which was the duration of the study.	were anaemic. Reference was only made to the control group with higher PCV in contrast to the treated groups. 7. The extract might have initiated a decreased synthesis by the liver if it is toxic.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		