

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_96724
Title of the Manuscript:	Histomorphological Observations In Reproductive Organs Of Wistar Rats Administered With Aqueous Leaf Extract Of Momordica Charantia
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.journalejmp.com/index.php/EJMP/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1- Yes, the manuscript has some importance for the scientific community. It evaluates the histopathological effect of a plant leaf extract on the reproductive organs for rats. 2- The article title seems good. 3- The abstract is well-written and comprehensive. 4- The article structure and subsections are correct. 5- Yes, the article is scientifically correct. But Figure 2 is missing from results section. 6- The references are sufficient and recent but they are not in sequence throughout manuscript. Also, the staining protocol in materials and methods should has a references. 7- The effect of 100 mg/Kg of MCE dose on rats ovaries is not shown in Figure 1.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English writing quality is good but attention should be made to some mistakes in grammar, punctuation and extra spaces throughout manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	- The abbreviation (MCE) does not stand well to "Momordica charantia aqueous leaf extract". - In introduction, please change "third work countries" into "third world countries". - Please rewrite the following sentence "Common ailments parts of the plant was traditionally used for are".	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

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