



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry</a>
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>I have just finished the review of the above-mentioned manuscript. I suggest following changes prior to consider this manuscript for publication:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1-The manuscript is very poorly written.</li> <li>2-The current manuscript is poorly organized.</li> <li>3-Title of the current manuscript is not correct/ attractive. 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»</li> <li>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.</li> <li>5-Please provide complete information for Group IV that how LycT+DEX was co-administered, whether it was oral administration or intraperitoneal administration.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>7-The introduction part of the manuscript is too tedious so I suggest to cut down it a bit and make it like a story to create the interest of the general readers also.</li> <li>8-The methodology section is also poorly organized. Clearly mention the grouping of the animals and number of animals in each group.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>10-The overall writing of the manuscript is very poor. The manuscript should subject for language improvement.</li> <li>11-The doses mentioned in the manuscript should clearly be mentioned.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>The official number/ diary number of ethical approval committee of the institute should be mentioned.</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Muhammad Babar Khawar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Central Punjab (UCP), Pakistan</b>