

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_97049
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF AQUEOUS SEED EXTRACTS OF SPHENOSTYLIS STENOCARPA ON THE REPRODUCTIVE INDICES OF MALE 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.journalbjournal.com/index.php/BJI/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, the manuscript is important for scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. There is, at least, one point missing to fully state that the manuscript is scientifically correct. <u>It is not mentioned in the materials and methods if the work was performed according with governmental guidelines and if it was approved.</u></p> <p>6. In my view, references are missing and those that were used are already old. More recent references should be used.</p> <p>7. Materials and methods, subsection 2.2 – which strain was used?</p> <p>8. Materials and methods, subsection 2.3, line 5 – Why it was multiplied by 140?</p> <p>9. Materials and methods, subsection 2.3, line 7 – Why it was used tween 80? What is this for?</p> <p>10. As far as I know this is the first study highlighting the impacts of S. stenocarpa on rats male reproductive system</p> <p>11. For additional suggestions, please, see the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, the English is comprehensive.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, the study is interesting and important for the scientific community. Congratulations!	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sílvia Cristina Fernandes Moreira
Department, University & Country	University of Aveiro, Portugal