



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1. Regarding the Manuscript under the title: Hepatoprotective Potency of Ethanolic Extract of Garcinia kola (Heckel) Seed against Acute Ethanol-Induced Oxidative Stress in Wistar Rats, there are still some issues to be addressed after the reviewers comments.</p> <p>2. First of all, no page numbers impedes the process of reviewing as well as indicating the location of issues found in the manuscript.</p> <p>3. Furthermore, the composition of the Abstract needs correction. There is no need to include so many details about the experiment procedure in the abstract. On the other hand the Results are scarcely described. It is not enough to write „These effects were regulated by <i>G. kola</i> administration”. All abbreviations used in the Results part of the Abstract should be explained before their first use in the text- a reader is confused.</p> <p>4. I agree with the previous reviewer that labels and producers of kits used for the experiment should be presented even if they are commercially available.</p> <p>5. The study groups are rather small, so the Authors should mention it as a limitation of their study.</p> <p>6. Alkaline phosphatase is a marker of cholestasis and it should be mentioned in the text.</p> <p>7. Moreover, I found an inconsistency between the results presented in Table 2 and their description in the Discussion. The statement: „... the activity of SOD in animals treated with <i>G. kola</i> prior to ethanol induction was significantly reduced when compared with those without <i>G. kola</i> pretreatment.” does not correspond to the SOD superscripts in Table 2.</p> <p>8. Also the References need correction. Some of them present abbreviated journal name, but the others entire names. The Authors should unify them.</p> <p>the paper can be reconsidered after minor revision.</p>	<p>Corrections have been effected as much as possible. Thank you.</p>