

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>It contains useful information.</p> <p>yes</p> <p>Needs modification as indicated below.</p> <p>yes</p> <p>it seems ok.</p> <p>Needs update; the most recent is in 2021. Reader needs to know happened in the past two years?</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Female Wistar rats were divided into 6 groups (A-F) of 6 animals each. Group A (normal control) received distilled water only. Group B (negative control) received 200mg/kg of cyclophosphamide only, while group C (positive control) received only 29mg/kg of Combo. On the other hand, groups D, E and F were pretreated with Combo doses of (15, 29, and 290 mg/kg) and were later treated with 200mg/kg of cyclophosphamide after 7 days. <p>These sentences should be omitted from abstract. *Abstract should contain a very short introduction leading the reader to the aim of the work. A glimpse on the method and a hint from the results and conclusion.</p> <p>MATERIAL AND METHODS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 36 female weight of about 200mg <p>Change to : 36 female weight of about 200 gm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "CYP" and all other abbreviations should be defined when its 1st mention in the manuscript or grouped in a list in the manuscript. <p>Results & Discussion Results of biochemical assays</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Authors stated in experimental design that "combo treatment started for seven days and cyclophosphamide continued from day eighth day till the 12th day" While captions below Figs 1 & 2 stated that "Effect of cyclophosphamide and combo on after <u>14 days of treatment</u>" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Which is right? 12 or 14? 2- Cyclophosphamide treatment continued for only 5 days and combo for 12 days. Correction of captions must be done. - "Administration of Combo alone resulted in, where it significantly <u>depletes</u> MDA level 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>(15.25±0.13) when compared with the control group (19.60±0.31)."</p> <p>Using the word "deplete" is too strong for 23.2% decrease of MDA level. Decrease, reduce, .. would be more accurate. As depletes is used in case of a severe decline like from 100% to 23%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The group treated with <u>a single dose</u> of" <p>A single dose means the drug was administered to animals only one time. Is this the case here ?! As the manuscript says otherwise. Clarification is needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "depleting GSH levels (54.64±0.35)" <p>Change the word deplete by another lighter word to express the real result. This goes for all the manuscript.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "<u>While at the high dose of Combo (290 mg/kg), the level of MDA reduced compared to the control, while the level of NO at that dose increased slightly when compared to the control and combo groups.</u>" <p>Rephrase using less "While" to deliver a proper meaning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AS "MDA, and NO" are oxidative stress markers, why authors gathered MDA with GSH in one graph instead of both MDA, and NO? <p>If there is a point here, please clarify. If not re assemble MDA, and NO in one grph.</p> <p>Histopathology Results</p> <p>Figs. 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10 & 11 have bad resolution and focusing. Change with better resolution ones.</p> <p>Conclusion Should be longer than the current one. It should summarize results. Then finalize using the current sentence.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is sufficient to deliver the info needed.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Mohamed M. M. Elnasharty</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>National Research Centre, Egypt</p>