

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJGH_124280
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF AGE ON COLONIC DAMAGE INDUCED BY CADMIUM EXPOSURE ON FEMALE WISTAR RATS
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>This study focuses on age related effects of cadmium on colon</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. However, could the author explain the rational behind the three ages group they used for this study. This is because 6-12 weeks old rats are classified as young rats, ≥35 weeks old rat are considered as middle age while ≥70 weeks old rats are considered as old. Do the authors think the closeness of the ages of rats used in this experiment is the reason why there are not differences in some biochemical parameters considered among groups?</li> <li>2. Section 2.4 says preparation of testicular homogenate, it should be Colon homogenate</li> <li>3. The images submitted are not taken at the same points. Authors should kindly take photomicrographs of the colon at the same point for all group.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Oluwatomilayo Patience Odum</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Ilorin, Nigeria</b>