

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JOCAMR_120628</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Cadmium-induced Up-regulation of Nitric Oxide Synthase Activity in Rats' Testes: Ameliorative Effect of PurXcel</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This work is an important contribution on the effects of Cadmium-induced Up-regulation of Nitric Oxide Synthase Activity in Rats'	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is informative enough and no need to add any new point.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are properly arranged.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	As to my knowledge, this work is scientifically correct and robust enough to be published in your journal. The authors have carried out their scientific career very good.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	As far as I know, the references are up-to-date and correctly arranged and used.	t
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. The language level is OK.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	There are a few minor corrections which I have marked in RED. Overall, the manuscript is suggested for publication in your journal.	

#### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nasrullah Rastegar-Pouyani
Department, University & Country	Razi University, Iran