Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Hepatology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRRHE_130055**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Changes in Histological Indices in the organs of New Zealand White Rabbits Treated with 2, 2- Dichlorovinyl Dimethyl Phosphate.**
Type of the 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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.	**Please add a stronger justification for the study. Explain why studying the chronic toxicological effects of dichlorvos is critical in the context of hepatology and public health.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**The title accurately reflects the study's content but can be more concise and engaging. Suggested alternative: Histopathological Changes in Organs of New Zealand White Rabbits Following Dichlorvos Exposure**	
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 effectively summarizes the study but could be improved with minor restructuring. Avoid redundancy, such as repeating the duration of exposure multiple times. To increase the value of the study, it is recommended to include statistical analysis.**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	**The methodology is detailed but somewhat repetitive. Please simplify the description of animal procurement, housing, and dichlorvos administration to avoid redundancy. Please enhance the discussion section by providing a more critical analysis of the results and connecting them to previous studies in hepatology.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	**The references are appropriate but could include more recent studies (post-2020) to reflect the latest developments.**	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	**The language is clear but requires improvements for precision and conciseness. Ensure figure legends are detailed enough for readers to understand without referring to the main text. Please check the entire document to ensure it complies with the journal's rules, for example: Fig..5" to "Fig. 5: Control."**	
Optional/General comments	**The title is suitable but could be slightly refined for conciseness and clarity. The abstract covers the study's aim, methodology, results, and conclusion but lacks numerical details and clear sectioning. The manuscript is scientifically correct, but it would benefit from stronger statistical evidence and expanded discussion of the implications. Please add more references are recent studies (post 2020) in Nigeria that would increase the relevance of this article, you can find them on Google Academic. The English is clear and understandable but has grammatical errors and occasional redundancy. Scholarly phrasing can be improved. Figures need better formatting and captions. Results can be structured more logically with quantifiable data. Ethical considerations are mentioned, but the manuscript should explicitly state the approval details for clarity. No evidence of plagiarism is apparent. The manuscript is scientifically sound, but it requires improvements in language quality, updated references, and the presentation of results. Once these revisions are made, the paper will be suitable for publication.**	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ionica Mihaela Iancu**
Department, University & Country	**University of Life Sciences "King Michael I", Romania**