

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_102050
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Cucumis sativus extract on the histomorphology of the ovaries and hormonal profile of adult female Wistar rats.
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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This research is commendable as it utilizes the Cucumber plant (<i>Cucumis sativus</i> L) as an alternative treatment in traditional medicine. This plant is easily accessible and affordable, making it accessible to a wide range of people in the community.</p> <p>Ok</p> <p>Ok</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate. However, a few sections could be further refined to better align with the standard structure of academic papers in the field.</p> <p>The scientific correctness of the manuscript could be improved. There are areas where additional references or citations would enhance the credibility of the findings and ensure alignment with existing scientific knowledge in the field.</p> <p>Additional recent literature needs to be included in the discussion section.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is acceptable, but there are some areas that need attention.</p> <p>Requires correcting the spelling of sentences and punctuation.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is necessary to seek clarification from the authors regarding several aspects, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there any previous research on the dosage of <i>Cucumis sativus</i> extract added? 2. Why does the low-dose group show a significant increase in FSH levels? 3. Why does the average estradiol level in the treatment group show no significant difference (PostHoc)? Could this be due to the insufficient dosage used? Please reconsider the rationale behind the dosage selection. Or could it be due to administering the treatment to rats in different cycle conditions? 	

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:

Name:	Kusmiati
Department, University & Country	Research Center for Biosystematics and Evolution, Indonesia