

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_99044
Title of the Manuscript:	Ameliorative Effects of Kolaviron, Garcinia Kola (Bitter Kola) Fruit Ethanolic Extract on Lead-Induced Adrenal Gland Toxicity using Adult Wistar-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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/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>1. The manuscript is very important to the scientific community.</p> <p>2. Ameliorative Effects of Kolaviron on Lead-Induced Adrenal Gland Toxicity in Adult Wistar Rats</p> <p>3. The results section is deficient and the use of Pb intoxication is inappropriate Pb toxicity should instead be used.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>5. The methodology is scientific, but the histology results are poorly presented and interpreted. In addition, the discussion is highly deficient, this is so because the results were not properly interpreted. Results: a. The micrographs should be captured in low magnification to show the cortical layers and the medulla in all the groups. b. High mag. Can then be shown to highlight the lesions observed in all groups; note comparable regions MUST be shown. c. The orientations of the micrographs must be the same, which is not in your case. d. The quality of the micrographs is poor (blurred) e. The Authors insinuated the infiltrations of lymphocytes; these cells can only be demonstrated in a high mag. We should see the features.</p> <p>Discussion There is no discussion but results in words in most cases; Cortisol was measured but never mentioned or discussed. The authors should stay away from speculation on parameters they did not measure e.g., antioxidants and organ weights.</p> <p>6. The references are ok but some can be added: Mohameda, Doha S.; Abol Hagagb, Kaled E.. Effect of lead acetate on the histological structure of the adrenal cortex of male albino rats and the possible protective role of vitamin E. The Egyptian Journal of Histology 34(3):p 496-504, September 2011. DOI: 10.1097/EHX.0000398853.05964.42 Rosol, Thomas J., et al. "Adrenal gland: structure, function, and mechanisms of toxicity." <i>Toxicologic pathology</i> 29.1 (2001): 41-48. Rana, S. V. S. "Perspectives in endocrine toxicity of heavy metals—a review." <i>Biological trace element research</i> 160.1 (2014): 1-14.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	There are minor grammatical and punctuation errors.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Philemon Shallie
Department, University & Country	University of Missouri, USA