

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMPS_103588</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Pharmacological Evaluation of Ovulation Inducing Potential of Siddha Herbomineral Formulation Arputha Mathirai on Estradiol Valerate Induced Poly Cystic Ovarian Syndrome Wistar Albino Rat Model</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:

(<https://www.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Not sufficient , requires more recent updated references especially in the discussion section.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Good job. Very well written. However, how the data was analysed was not mentioned in the methods section. Even the result sections, this not mentioned how significant was the difference of the hormonal levels compared to rats given clomiphene. It is suggested for the author to use ANOVA test to acquire significant results. Then the results would have conclusive evidence.</p> <p>The Discussion section was too short. The references cited wasn't enough. Articles to strongly suggest the research as being in agreement to the previous research done was not mentioned. And vice versa, as to make the research findings more concrete. Further improvements can be made to make this article to stand out among the rest if done correctly.</p> <p>Well done.</p>	

### 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)
<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:

Name:	Azmah Sa'at
Department, University & Country	Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia