

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_100795
Title of the Manuscript:	Histo-Architectural and Testicular Weight Changes in Wistar Rats Fed with Graded Doses of Piliostigma thonningii (Schumach)
Type of the 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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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>Yes</p> <p>Title should emphasize that extracts of the plant were fed to the rats and not the entire plant</p> <p>A very comprehensive abstract. So much so that there are things in the abstract that are not in the main paper. Such as the mention that One-Way ANOVA was used to analyze the data. I didn't see any discussion of statistical methods in the body of the paper.</p> <p>Yes Yes</p> <p>The graphs that are used are not the best ones to display the data. There are no error bars on the graphs. Also, with such a small sample size, the authors should have provided a table of results along with a graph.</p> <p>Also, there is no discussion of the statistical methods used. No mention of any software used to perform the One-way ANOVA.</p> <p>No need to describe the dilution calculations. The reader assumes the authors know how to dilute a solution.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lee Kozar
Department, University & Country	Stanford University, USA