



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Medicinal Plants</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_52698
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Functional Iron Indices and Highly Sensitive CRP Post Single Dose Irradiation with Cobalt60 and the Ameliorating Effects of Single and Combined Doses of Aqueous Extracts of Parquetina nigrescens, Camellia sinensis and Telfairia occidentalis in Guinea Pigs</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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/page.php?id=sd-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>The research article has original results and scientific relevance that will contribute to reduce toxic effects of radiotherapy. However, the manuscript requires following: Include in the abstract, the results of aqueous extracts <i>Camellia sinensis</i>, <i>Telfairia occidentalis</i> and <i>Parquetina nigrescens</i> in Guinea pigs pre and post-irradiation with Cobalt 60 in iron function and compare between them. Introduction, Materials and Methods are adequate but results must be reviewed, <b>Tables 1-8, no show statistical differences with control ( at day 0), the statistical differences between the data are more relevant than the value of P on the tables. Discussion is adequate. Finally, after modifications, this manuscript is appropriate to be accepted.</b></b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Research paper requires minor revisions, specifically results, compare effects between aqueous extracts.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I suggest to authors highlight their results better because they are of great scientific relevance in radiotherapy.	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>María Elena Calderón-Segura</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México.</b>