

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_101146
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of the Safety of Aqueous Extract of Corn (Zea mays) Husks in Wistar Albino Rats
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljalsi.com/index.php/JALSI/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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, scientifically such important topics should be regularly addressed. Zea mays L. (Poaceae) husk decoctions are traditionally used in the treatment of different diseases by various tribes in the world. It could be a better alternative of allopathic drugs with potential side effects and MDR. 2. Title is good with a little amendment i.e. Maize is the common name for Zea mays. I would recommend to add this name as well along with its scientific one in the title. 3. The abstract is structured and well written with appropriate word count i.e., 295. Little important information is missing mentioned in the document. (Duration of the study and sample size). 4. Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript seems appropriate with few corrections as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion should be revised. No need to repeat the results in discussion. Please add few more reference articles for comparison and contrast. • In subsection 2.5 of Material and Methods, Hematological and Serum Biochemical analysis is missing. 5. Yes, it seems scientifically correct. 6. References are sufficient, almost 50 % are taken from new articles. Correction required in few references highlighted in manuscript. E.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurately abbreviate the Journal Title ...can be searched at PubMed or from the published articles of that journal. • Page number should be written as e.g., 1156 - 60 rather than 1156—1160 7. The name of the Board or Committee giving approval and the study number assigned is not given in the whole manuscript. 8. Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) version is not mentioned. 9. Recommendations should not be the part of conclusion. They should be written in separate subheading. 10. Limitation of the study is not given 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, it is satisfactory.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is a good study, beneficial in the field of medicine. I have highlighted the minor mistakes in the manuscript. It will be convenient for the author to do the corrections smoothly.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Best wishes</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:	Shazia Taj
Department, University & Country	Islamic International Medical College, Pakistan