

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JOCAMR_104355 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Mollification of lead induced liver injury by Lycopersicon esculentum (Tomato) extract. |
| 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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/editorial-policy>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>It is an important job in the community.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>The subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate, however, the observations indicated in the manuscript must be addressed.</p> <p>The manuscript is appropriate and scientifically correct.</p> <p>It is necessary to indicate in the methodology section many of the references used in the experimental techniques used.</p> <p>References are sufficient to support the work done.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The language is suitable for the manuscript</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>It is a well structured work and once the corrections are made there is no problem in accepting for publication.</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: | Dolores Castañeda Antonio |
| Department, University & Country | Research Center in Microbiological Sciences, Meritorious Autonomous University of Puebla, Mexico |