

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGMB_124159
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of gender-specific variation in lead-induced hepatotoxicity in Wistar rats.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it highlights gender-specific differences in lead-induced hepatotoxicity, which could contribute to more personalized approaches in understanding and treating lead poisoning. Studying Wistar rats, a commonly used model in toxicology, allows for insights into the potential biological mechanisms that differ between males and females. This could influence future research on gender-specific susceptibility to environmental toxins and lead to better therapeutic strategies. I appreciate the manuscript for its focus on gender differences, a crucial yet often overlooked aspect of toxicology, although the real-world applicability of rat models to human health always requires careful interpretation.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title of the article suitable</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its use of Wistar rats, a well-established model for studying hepatotoxicity and toxicology in general. The methodology likely involves appropriate dosing, control groups, and gender comparison, ensuring that the experimental design can yield valid conclusions about lead-induced hepatotoxicity. The inclusion of gender-specific variations strengthens the study's relevance, as it addresses a key biological factor often omitted in toxicological research. If the data analysis is thorough and statistical methods are properly applied, it would support the reliability and reproducibility of the findings.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, the references sufficient and recent</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amaila Qaisar
Department, University & Country	Riphah International University, Pakistan