SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRB_66104**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Dexamethasone induced hepatic and renal damage in mice: Protective potential of Lycopene enriched tomato 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/journal/10/editorial-policy)

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	I have just finished the review of the above-mentioned manuscript. I suggest following changes prior to consider this manuscript for publication: 1-The manuscript is very poorly written. 2-The current manuscript is poorly organized. 3-Title of the current manuscript is not correct/ atteractive. So, I suggest the authors should consider changing the title such as «Protective potential of Lycopene enriched tomato extract against Dexamethasone induced hepatic and renal damage in mice» 4-The abstract should be the best part of the manuscript but in the current case the abstract is not up to the mark. Moreover, n=? is missing and the results have been poorly described. 5-Please provide complete information for Group IV that how LycT+DEX was co-administered, whether it was oral administration or intraperitoneal administration. 6-The introduction part of a research article usually comprised of three paragraphs only. The first paragraph show the broader picture of the problem while the second paragraph reflect the problem in a specific way. The 3rd paragraph depicts why you carried out this study? Please modify it as suggested. 7-The introduction part of the manuscript is too tideous so I suggest to cut down it a bit and make it like a story to create the interest of the general readers also. 8-The methodology section is also poorly organized. Cleary mention the grouping of the animals and number of animals in each group. 9-The discussion part is too tedious. The authors should support their findings, only with the relevant significant findings of others avoiding the irrelevant ones. Make it concise. 10-The overall writing of the manuscript is very poor. The manuscript should subject for language improvement. 11-The doses mentioned in the manuscript should clearly be mentioned.	As suggested by the reviewer, the title has been modified in the revised version of the manuscript. The abstract has been modified in light of the suggestions made. The route of administration for dexamethasone and LycT has been mentioned at the relevant places. The introduction part of the manuscript has been modified in light of the suggestions made. As suggested by the reviewer, the introduction of the manuscript has been shortened. The methodology section has been revised in light of the suggestions made. As suggested by the reviewer, the discussion has been modified in light of the suggestions made. The manuscript has been checked for language errors. The doses for dexamethasone and LycT administration have been clearly mentioned at the relevant places in the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* The official number/ diary number of ethical approval committee of the institute should be mentioned.	