

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJGH_130506
Title of the Manuscript:	Hepatoprotective effect of Honey and Green tea on Atrazine induced hepatotoxicity in Albino Wistar rats
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<div><div>i.</div><div>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it investigates the hepatoprotective effects of green tea and honey on atrazine-induced hepatotoxicity in albino Wistar rats.</div><div>ii.</div><div>The study's findings contribute to the existing body of knowledge on natural remedies for liver damage and provide insights into the potential mechanisms of action.</div><div>iii.</div><div>The research has implications for the development of novel therapeutic strategies for liver diseases.</div><div>iv.</div><div>The manuscript addresses a timely and relevant research question.</div></div>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title: Hepatoprotective Effect of Green Tea and Honey on Atrazine Induced Hepatotoxicity in Albino Wistar Rats, is suitable and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and provides a clear overview of the study's objective, methodology, main findings, and conclusions. <b>However, I suggest adding more details about the statistical analysis and the specific mechanisms by which green tea and honey exert their hepatoprotective effects.</b>	Authors think that all the statistical tools used for the study and the statistical package and its version, were stated in the abstract. About the mechanism, authors do not deem it necessary to include discussion in the abstract, as it is not in lie with the conventional format for writing abstracts.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The research methodology and design are sound, and the data analysis and interpretation are appropriate. <b>However, I recommend adding more details about the experimental design, such as the randomization process and the control of environmental factors.</b>	Authors think that the design of the study is explicit enough for understanding. As for the control of environmental factors, authors do not really understand what the reviewer meant by environmental factors, as the subjects used are laboratory animals and the design and objectives of the study did not take cognisance of the influence of environmental factors.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited in the manuscript are sufficient and recent. However, I suggest adding more references to support the discussion on the potential mechanisms of action of green tea and honey. Some recommended references include: <div><div>i.</div><div>Hepatoprotective effects of green tea polyphenols (Journal of Nutrition and Biochemistry, 2018)</div><div>ii.</div><div>Honey and its medicinal properties (Journal of Medicinal Food, 2017)</div></div>	More information and references have been added.

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the manuscript are suitable for scholarly communication. <b>However, I recommend proofreading the manuscript to correct minor grammatical errors and improve sentence clarity.</b>	The manuscript has been proofread and corrections have been made.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, the manuscript is well-written and contributes to the existing body of knowledge on natural remedies for liver damage. <b>With some minor revisions</b> , the manuscript has the potential to be a strong publication.	Minor revisions have been made.

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No ethical issuses.