

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_109451
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF THE HISTOMORPHOLOGY OF SMALL INTESTINE EXPOSED TO ELIOZU DUMPSITE LEACHATE USING WISTAR RATS AS EXPERIMENTAL MODEL
Type of the Article	research article

### 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>1. The manuscript can be seen as a contribution to the extensive discussion on the municipal solid waste management in Nigeria and other developing countries. Its medical point of view pays attention to the histomorphology of small intestine of Wistar rats exposed to Elioazu dumpsite leachate. Qualitative results are presented in a transparent form for a rather large interdisciplinary class of potential readers (including the reviewer, who is not expert in medicine), without proper statistical evaluation.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is rather long, but comprehensive. Some language corrections and removal of misprints are needed; cf. <i>Minor revision comments</i> and <i>Optional/General comments</i>.</p> <p>4. The article contains only 3 unnumbered sections, called <i>Introduction</i>, <i>Materials and methods</i> and <i>Discussion</i>, with 1 level of subsections, supplied by 11 items of <i>References</i>. This structure of the article can be respected; only <i>Results</i> and <i>Conclusion</i> should be presented as separate sections. <i>References</i> are incomplete: see lower.</p> <p>5. The article presents an experimental research, whose results are expectable, thus its scientific significance is not very high. However, these results seem to be correct and interesting for experts in municipal solid waste management and public health in developing countries.</p> <p>6. The author's choice of 11 presented items of <i>References</i> can be respected, but their form is not acceptable and numerous other items are missing. Formal errors can be demonstrated e.g. on the 1<sup>st</sup> item: i) full authors' names are not unified with the 2<sup>nd</sup> item, ii) = character, including preceding space character, are misprints, iii) the journal title should be (MDPI) Sustainability (without any text like "A Reviewed"), iv) the volume is mismatched. The most important argument for the substantial revision of all <i>References</i> is the absence of many needed items: how to find e.g. (Alam <i>et al.</i>, 2008, Al Sabbagh <i>et al.</i>, 2012) from <i>Discussion</i>?</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The English style is acceptable in general, but particular corrections are needed: e.g. "environmental" and "Elioazu dumpsite" (1<sup>st</sup> capital letter) in <i>Abstract</i>, or <i>Figures</i> instead of <i>Plates</i>. However, language corrections are supposed as a part of the global formal revision, required by <i>Optional/General comments</i>.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>A hypothetical complete list of all misprints, non-unified quotations (including various types of parenthesis), typographical errors (as different size of comparable figures), etc., could be even longer than the whole submitted text. To reach a standard level for scientific publications, the careful revision of the manuscript is necessary.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jiří Vala</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Mathematics and Descriptive Geometry, Brno University of Technology, Czechia</b>