

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_99951
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF CLOMIPHENE CITRATE ON THE HORMONAL PROFILE OF ADULT FEMALE WISTAR RATS WITH REGULAR ESTROUS CYCLE
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.journalarjgo.com/index.php/ARJGO/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>1- Yes, this manuscript is important to the biomedical community as it evaluates the effect of clomiphene on the hormonal profile of rats.</p> <p>2- Yes, the title of manuscript is suitable.</p> <p>3- No, the abstract is not comprehensive as it lacks background information about the drug clomiphene. Also, the abstract is not concise as a very detailed information about methodology was presented.</p> <p>4- The manuscript is structured in appropriate way but it is missing keywords section.</p> <p>5- Yes, the manuscript looks scientifically correct but authors didn't mention any details about statical study used and what software used to carry out this analysis.</p> <p>6- References look sufficient and recent.</p> <p>7- Authors are encouraged to give more background information about the numbers and percentages of various stages of estrous cycle.</p> <p>8- Authors are advised to introduce some bars figures to represent results.</p> <p>9- Introduction need to be written in a better way.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Authors need to give more attention to mistakes in grammar and punctuation.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hasanain Abdulhameed Odhar
Department, University & Country	Al-Zahrawi University College, Iraq