

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_99266
Title of the Manuscript:	COMBO PLANTS THERAPY MODIFIES FERTILITY MARKERS IN CYCLOPHOSPHAMIDE-INDUCED OVARIAN TOXICITY IN 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.journalajrimps.com/index.php/AJRIMPS/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. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. No, as the approval protocol number by the ethics animal committee is missing. 6. No. Many of them are not recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes. But, the article must be proofread by a grammarian.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p><u>Preparation of Combo</u> Please, rewrite the sentences as they are difficult to understand.</p> <p><u>Collection of serum and tissue samples</u> Replace sacrificed by euthanized. Why were the animals not euthanized 24 hours after the last treatment?</p> <p><u>Histopathological investigation of the ovaries</u> The name of each group must be the same all the time. Please, use group A or CNTL, group B or G1, etc. Using different group names makes it difficult to read.</p> <p><u>Results of biochemical assays</u> Figures 1, 2, 3 and 4 do not show markings about the statistical differences.</p> <p><u>Histopathology Results</u> All photomicrographs are of poor quality in terms of resolution and quality. All of them must be replaced. It is not possible to observe all the structures described and/or prove the morphology described in the text. The manuscript did not present quantitative and qualitative pathological analyses to confirm whether or not there was an improvement in the histology of the ovarian follicles. The authors must perform morphometric and pathological analyses to unequivocally conclude the findings.</p> <p><u>DISCUSSION</u> "The toxic effects of Cyclophosphamide on the ovary include reducing the number of primordial, preantral, and antral follicles [...]and these have been demonstrated in this study" This is not true, as the authors did not count the number of different types of follicles. "Studies have demonstrated that the high concentrations of the antioxidant GSH in oocytes are necessary for normal fertilization" The authors did not cite the works mentioned. The Discussion failed to detail the existing relationships between the biochemical and histological findings, in order to confirm the results found along with other published works.</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:	Breno Henrique Caneguim
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal do Triângulo Mineiro, Brazil