



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Applied Life Sciences International</a>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JALSI_64556   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | In vivo action of the minerals of Mucuna pruriens and Millettia pinnata (Fabaceae) on the hemogram of Oryctolagus cuniculus. |
| 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/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|  | Reviewer's comment   | Author's comment (if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> | <p><b>Comments to editors</b><br/><b>Dear editor-in-chief</b></p> <p>The ms entitled "<i>In vivo</i> action of the minerals of <i>Mucuna pruriens</i> and <i>Millettia pinnata</i> (Fabaceae) on the hemogram of <i>Oryctolagus cuniculus</i>." has been carefully reviewed. The question addressed by the review article is relevant and is interesting. However the paper is not well written, the text is not much clear and confusing especially the abstract section. The conclusion is not consistent with the evidence provided and also not well addressed the question. The paper includes tables that help to aid in a better understanding of ms. Figures are also missing. Moreover, there are also some scientific, typographic and grammatical mistakes in the manuscript that need improvement. This manuscript has the potential to make an important contribution to the literature. Thus, I recommended it as a major revision.</p> <p><b>Comments to authors</b><br/><b>Title</b></p> <p>The title did not produce a good sound like a repetition of the term "of" please rephrase the title</p> <p><b>Abstract</b></p> <p>The abstract should be concise, factual and states briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. It is presented separately from the article and stands alone. The abstract is written and arranged in unsystematic order. Secondly, the key findings were confusing and the conclusion was not mentioned clearly at the end.</p> <p>Please improve this section in the following order.</p> <p>Background of the research 2 to 3 lines<br/>Aims<br/>Material and Methods<br/>Results (key findings)<br/>Discussion<br/>Conclusion.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>The introduction chapter states the objectives of the work and provides a suitable background and focuses on the main background of the study. But in this paper, the introduction section is below the standard. I found some mistakes that need improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first word in the introduction section Envenimation is correct? Please confirm it.</li> <li>• The first paragraph is too confusing what the actual message the authors want to deliver? Please stay in one. Rewrite the first paragraph and try to focus on the <i>In vivo</i> action of the minerals of medicinal plant on the hemogram of <i>Oryctolagus cuniculus</i> and other species of this genus or Family.</li> </ul> |   |



SDI Review Form 1.6

- Start the introduction from global significance and then moves towards your local perspective research topic.
- Please extend the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph by citing some latest citations.
- Please write and states the objectives of the work and provides a suitable background and focuses on the main background of the study.

"In West Africa, particularly in Benin, 80% of snake bites are reported to use traditional treatment rather than modern Western medicine [4, 10]."

- Before the above sentence, please also add a sentence that in Asia traditional treatment is also used to treat snakebite by citing below-mentioned citation,

a) <http://nopr.niscair.res.in/handle/123456789/47089>

b) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chnaes.2018.12.006>

- The aims are not clear please modify and make it clear that why you document this study?

**Materials and methods**

- Please remove the subheadings 2.1 and 2.2. as Materials and methods heading in enough.

**2.2.1.1 Calculation of incineration efficiency**

**2.2.1.2 Scarification method for experimental batches**

**2.2.2 Method of blood collection**

- **Please add a citation in each of the above-mentioned headings**

This section also needs improvement please modify it.

**Results**

Please arrange the results in headings form and avoid confusion. Systematically arrange results by keeping the title of the ms in mind.

Please focus on the key points mentioned in the title. Also remove the typographic, grammatical and scientific mistakes.

Please provide figures in this section.

Also include animal and plant images in one figure.

**Discussion**

Please also arrange this section in a systematic way i.e., arrange them in paragraphs.

Please remove grammatical mistakes especially in this section and throughout the manuscript.

**Conclusion**

This section should reflect upon the aims - whether they were achieved or not - and, just like the aims, should not be surprising and stands alone. Please make the conclusion clear and provide all the justifications of the aims.



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                                  |  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
|                                  | <p><b>References</b><br/>Please ensure that every reference cited in the text is also present in the reference list and vice versa. I found that in some reference page numbers and volume etc are missing provide it. Follow the general guideline of the Journal for references.</p> <p><b>Concluding marks</b><br/>Based on the above comments and the quality of the manuscript, the overall concept of the paper is good but not presented well. Thus I recommended it as a major revision.</p> |  |
| <b>Minor REVISION</b> comments   | No   |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments | No   |  |

**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> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                 |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Saraj Bahadur</b>            |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Hainan University, China</b> |