

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Medicine and Health Research</a>
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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> ( <i>Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here</i> )
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript titled "Biochemical and Nephrotoxic Effects of Odogwu Bitters and Goko Cleanser on Wistar Rat Kidneys" presents significant findings that contribute to our understanding of both the biochemical pathways and potential nephrotoxic effects of these substances. This study is particularly relevant as it addresses the increasing use of herbal products, like Odogwu Bitters, and raises awareness about their safety profiles. I appreciate this manuscript for its comprehensive approach and rigorous methodology, which provide valuable insights for researchers and healthcare professionals alike. Overall, the implications of this research could greatly enhance our knowledge regarding the impact of herbal remedies on kidney health.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>The title "Biochemical and Nephrotoxic Effects of Odogwu Bitters and Goko Cleanser on Wistar Rat Kidneys" is suitable as it clearly conveys the primary focus of the research. It precisely indicates the subject matter, the specific substances under investigation, and the model organism used. However, an alternative title that may enhance clarity could be: "Impact of Odogwu Bitters and Goko Cleanser on Biochemical Parameters and Kidney Toxicity in Wistar Rats." This revision emphasizes the study's objectives while maintaining a formal tone.</b>	

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>Your abstract appears comprehensive and accurate, but there are a few points that could enhance it:</b>  <b>Greater clarity in results:</b> It's better to detail the main results with more specific numbers and data. For instance, instead of saying "significant alterations in these parameters," specify exactly how much these changes were.  <b>Connection between findings:</b> Provide more explanation on how the phytochemical findings (e.g., saponins, flavonoids, and alkaloids) relate to the biochemical results (e.g., levels of creatinine and urea).  <b>Dose impact:</b> Mentioning how different doses of the herbal products impact the results could be helpful.  <b>Mechanism explanation:</b> If possible, offer a brief explanation of the biochemical mechanisms that might lead to the observed effects.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</b></p>	
<p><b>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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p><b>This is a scientifically robust and technically sound manuscript. The authors have conducted thorough biochemical and nephrotoxic analyses to assess the effects of Odogwu Bitters and Goko Cleanser on Wistar rat kidneys. Their methodologies are clearly outlined, allowing for reproducibility and validation of results. The significant findings are supported by comprehensive data and statistical analysis, demonstrating rigorous scientific investigation</b></p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p><b>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. However, references number 5 and 20 are quite old and do not seem essential in the list of references. It is suggested to use more up-to-date sources.</b></p>	

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. The text is clear, concise, and free from major grammatical errors. The terminology used is appropriate for the scientific context, and the sentences are well-structured, which helps in conveying the intended meaning effectively.</p> <p>However, a few minor improvements can enhance the overall readability:</p> <p>In the sentence "Herbal mixtures offer a variety of benefits, ranging from an increase in sexual performance, treatment of several diseases and even aid in weight loss [4-6]", consider changing "treatment of several diseases" to "treating several diseases" for parallel structure.</p> <p>In the sentence "Herbal bitters are alcohol-based herbal drinks which are often used as a digestive aid and an appetite stimulant [7,8]", consider adding a comma before "which" to improve readability.</p> <p>Overall, these minor revisions will ensure the text is even more aligned with the standards of scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Overall, the article is good and reliable.</p> <p>It is better to mention in the Materials and Methods section whether this research has approval from the Bioethics Committee on Biological and Medical Research. If yes, please include the approval number and code from the Bioethics Committee.</p>	

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Ghasem Habibi</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Arak University of Medical Sciences, Islamic Azad University, Iran</b></p>