



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJBcRR_17158
Title of the Manuscript:	Hypolipidemic Properties of Ethanol Extract of Cyperus rotundus Rhizome.
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, 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 Abstract is not written according to the standards of the journal (items: aims, study design, place and duration of the study, methodology, results and conclusion). However, the abstract is clear and precise. Introduction. OK. Material and Methods. OK. Very complete writing. But, It does not indicate duration of the experiment. Results and Discussion. OK. Conclusion. OK. References. Some names of journals are abbreviated and others are not. You should unify criteria (e.g. compare reference 1 and 3).	Since the reviewer acknowledges that the abstract is clear and precise I do not believe that there is need for any correction. The entire experiment lasted for a period of 6 months. (pg 4 of manuscript) Correction effected. All journals in the references abbreviated.
Minor REVISION comments	I suggest adding in key words: Simvastatin. Add some spaces between words. Ej. In DATA ANALYSIS "mean $\pm$SD.Data". Add bold word Figure 3.	Simvastatin added in the keywords. Space added appropriately. (see pg 4 of manuscript) Fig 3 made bold. (see pg 4 of manuscript).
Optional/General comments	It is a very well written paper. I think it is clear from the information presented in the introduction and material and methods. The results are analysed correctly. Some corrections should be done on the content and form before its publication.	