



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBcRR_19854
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Chloroform-Ethanol Extracts of Cashew (<i>Anacardium occidentale</i>) Kernel on Electrolyte Imbalance in Castor Oil-induced Diarrhea Rats.
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	1. The results section should be clearly stated to avoid contradicting statement (discrepancy) i.e., line 134-136; this statement is not true as per the results in table2 and 3. The authors should state which comparison control group they used to be able to generate significant results. 2. The authors should use either Cashew nut or <i>A.occidentale</i> after making it clear at the abstract to the consecutive statements thereafter. 3. The authors should state clearly on the control groups used normal, negative or positive not as mere control group. 4. Labelling of the groups should be uniform i.e., A or ii as in line no: 88-92 5. Acknowledgement statement; source of funding if any; conflict of interest statement if any and the review and ethical body involved in this study should be included in the study. Please clarify the ethical issue: : The authors needs to indicates the research and ethical review body involved and/or ethical review number given to this study; Sources of funding and a statement of any conflict of interest	Line 134-136: it was increase and not reduction according to table 2. Correction has been made. Since it has been made clear at the abstract, either of the names can be used in the consecutive statements. Only one control was indicated in the tables and the write up, the other control was referred to as standard drug group. Thanks, labelling of the groups has been corrected to alphabet only: 88-92 The research was self sponsored and there is no conflict of interest. The ethical issue has been included with the experimental design.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	1. The punctuation marks at the title should be deleted (.) 2. The authors should use either ethanol-chloroform or Chloroform-ethanol extract in their writings to promote uniformity. 3. The ratio of Ethanol: chloroform used for extraction should be stated. 4. Punctuations i.e., line no: 12, 15 and 88. 5. The authors should give the multiplicative factor used to generate 2nd phase doses for acute toxicity and that used to deduce the study doses of 21 and 84mg/kg btw of the study plant extracts. 6. The line no: 98, 103-104 statements should be rewritten to avoid repetition. 7. The author's should state the source of mice as 8. stated as per line no: 63-64. 9. The sample size of the rats used in the study is not state per treatment group (n=??). 10. Signs of lethality if any should be stated and a clear statement of LD₅₀ Value should be gives i.e., The LD₅₀ Value was found to be above 5000mg/kg, as per the OECD-guidelines (2008/2010) this value is said to be experimentally safe. 11. The significant values at the footnotes of the tables should be clearly stated in comparison to which group! 12. Finally, the authors should declare among the various separations of the extract which had better or best activity for further screening/elucidation.	Agreed and corrected Agreed and corrected Agreed and inserted as extraction procedure line 61-73 Agreed and corrected The dose was determine base on the fact that the plant was not toxic at 5000 mg/kg b. W and the amount that can be consume by human at once was extrapolated to the animal weight. No repetition. Agreed and corrected Agreed and corrected No lethality at the heighest dose used in this study (5000 mg/kg b. W.) with was reported It was stated with asterisk Agreed and stated in the conclusion
---------------------------------------	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	NB: Studies of this calibre are greatly encouraged, especially with diarrhoea being a major challenge in this 21 st Century. In-addition search for novel alternative remedies to orthodox medicine is wanting. However, the authors should have included the “enteropooling activity of the extracts” since they were able to collect the fluid volume in the ileum. This could have attributed greatly, in theorising the modes of action of this magic plant towards diarrhoea.	
---	---	--