

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_109596
Title of the Manuscript:	Aspartame, Chronic kidney insufficiency and Ocimumgratissimum extract.
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
-		

Review Form 1.7

<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>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>-the author should mention the species of animals used in the abstract section. - in the methodology section how the could be reliable while the author used different doses for the treated animals as one was 250and considered a low dose of aspartame while the second group was administered 100 and considered the high dose. Moreover, doses of the protective substance was also different to both groups. It lacks the basic concepts for scientific research as only one variable should be used and compared. In some sections of methodology and results the author wrote liver sample????!!!! And the study is made on renal tissue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The figures of renal tissues are not adequate and not representative for the written results. - The discussion is too long, not explaining the findings for example the results of weight are not justified as well as most of the results. - In fact the discussion is a repetition of the result without reasonable justification. - Most of the results paragraphs without referral to references. - The references used to extract the protective substance from leaves should be added. <p>The whole manuscript needs to be revised carefully for grammatical and spelling mistakes and rewritten.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> <p>No</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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Mona Hassan Mohamed Ali</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Suez Canal University, Egypt</p>