

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_112233
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTI-INFLAMMATORY EFFECTS OF NANOPARTICLES CONTAINING ALPHA-HUMULENE IN A MODEL OF ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE
Type of the Article	

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>These are my review comments regarding the manuscript.</p> <p>1. The manuscript writing pattern is not up to the standard of the journal and requires proofreading to improve its readability. I will suggest a professional academic English editing services should be used to improve the standard of the manuscript.</p> <p>2. NHUM, CN, CP, IFN etc., please expand the acronyms in the abstract.</p> <p>3. The most important issue is Sample size calculation: Sample size calculations for animal studies are inappropriate and not extrapolated from human data.</p> <p>4. The authors should go through relevant literature about calculating sample size in animal studies.</p> <p>5. Many software is available for calculating the same, which can be used.</p> <p>6. The methodology section should be re-written due to poor readability</p> <p>7. The methodology section would have been better if it had been sub-sectioned i.e. animal & grouping, chemicals & drugs, dose and dosing, and statistical analysis.</p> <p>8. The authors should give references for the doses administrated in each group.</p> <p>9. The title of the table should be concise with footnotes if required.</p> <p>10. Statistical terminologies should be used as and when required, and expressions like 'positive, strongly positive' should be avoided.</p> <p>11. The referencing is done casually.</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:	Supriya Pradhan
Department, University & Country	M.K.C.G. Medical College and Hospital, India