

Journal Name:	Journal of Medicine and Health Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOMHR_12539
Title of the Manuscript:	Dual Herbal Impact: Biochemical and Nephrotoxic Effects of Odogwu Bitters and Goko Cleanser on Wistar Rat Kidneys
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Manuscript is not written as per the requirements of a toxicity paper Parameters evaluated are not sufficient enough to establish toxicity Authors have not referred other similar papers. Lots of unnecessary tables making the manuscript very lengthy. Sample size is very small. Not sufficient to draw conclusions. Data inadequate for this manuscript to be considered a full length paper.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is misleading. Very few parameters have been studied making it insufficient to be considered a scientific paper.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract not satisfactory	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, lots of unnecessary sub headings. Authors have to refer similar papers and reframe	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A	Manuscript is not technically sound	

minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	NO	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	NO	
Optional/General comments	PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amar Deep Soren
Department, University & Country	B. Borooah College, India