

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_105697
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Zingiber officinale and Seeds of Aframomum melegueta Extract on the Biochemical and Immunological Indices of Stress-Induced 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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/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>The document contains publishable information, I have some observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title could be more impressive. 2. In the methodology there are errors, for example, the names of the plants are not in italics and it mentions that the extract was concentrated at 500C, review the methodology in detail. 3. In the results section, it is not necessary to repeat the result in the different sections, it is understood that it is the section for the results. 4. The conclusion has to be punctual based on the objective, the conclusion that is presented is very extensive. <p>As a general comment, paragraphs do not have to exceed six lines.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adrian Zaragoza Bastida
Department, University & Country	Instituto de Ciencias Agropecuarias, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo, Mexico