

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_103918
Title of the Manuscript:	Cannabidiol Oil and Prednisolone Treatment Altered Hematologic Indices, Serum Urea, Creatinine and Cellular Architecture of Kidney on Cadmium Induced Toxicity in Male Wistar Rats
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>- this manuscript is important considering the worldwide use of prednisolone and cannabis products, some of them without medical prescription. Therefore, elucidating their main adverse reactions may help us better understand and uniformize their indications. This experimental study is well conducted, respecting all animal rights and having a proper experimental protocol, and so the authors are entitled to draw some important conclusions.</p> <p>- in my opinion, the title of this manuscript is suitable for a scientific paper.</p> <p>- the abstract section might be rewritten for more clarity.</p> <p>- the manuscript has a proper structure for an experimental study</p> <p>- the manuscript sounds scientifically correct.</p> <p>- the references are mostly based on titles older than 5-7 years. This aspect might be improved with more recent articles, and therefore increasing the values of the discussion section which, at this point, seems scarce.</p> <p>- abbreviations should be explained at first appearance in the main text, irrespective of the abstract section</p> <p>- abstract section should be rewrite for the authors to avoid repeating words</p> <p>- English language used in this manuscript should be improved</p> <p>- in the final part of the introduction section, the authors should provide the reason of performing this study and the results they were hoping to achieve in the first place</p> <p>- the tables should have a footer containing all the explanations for the abbreviations used within it</p> <p>- "Red Cell Count" – I think it is Red Blood Cell Count</p> <p>- "Method used by Obembe et al., (2015)." – maybe you can say "This method was used by Obembe et al., (2015)." – the same aspected should be corrected all over the manuscript</p> <p>- in Section 2.4 , what represents R2 and R3?</p> <p>- the first paragraph of the discussion section should have a reference</p> <p>- conclusion section should be completed with possible applications of these discoveries and future research directions</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tiglis Mirela
Department, University & Country	Emergency Clinical Hospital of Bucharest, Romania