

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_124115
Title of the Manuscript:	HEART HISTOMORPHOLOGICAL CHANGES OF ADULT WISTAR RATS EXPOSED TO 3, 4 METHYLENEDIOXYMETHAMPHETAMINE PILLS
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript is important for the scientific community as with the rising use of synthetic drugs, understanding their effects on vital organs like the heart is critical for public health. 2. The study's findings provide valuable insights into the structural damage that may occur in the cardiac tissue after prolonged MDMA exposure, contributing to the growing body of knowledge on the adverse health effects of recreational drugs. 3. I like this manuscript because it addresses a relevant issue with clear, focused research and presents evidence of potential harm that can inform future health policies. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable, however to for more scientific clarity the possible alternative could be : "Cardiac Histomorphological Alterations in Adult Wistar Rats Following Exposure to 3,4-Methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDMA) Pills."</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>The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from minor adjustments. Adding specific details about the dosage of MDMA administered to each group would improve clarity. Additionally, stating the primary method used for histological processing could enhance transparency. It might also be helpful to briefly mention the dose-dependent nature of the effects, as this would indicate the severity of damage about the amount of MDMA consumed.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be 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 study demonstrates scientific correctness and is technically sound. It appropriately identifies the research gap regarding the effects of MDMA on cardiac histomorphology, utilizes relevant experimental models (Wistar rats), and employs well-established histological techniques. The discussion contextualizes the findings about existing literature, providing a comprehensive understanding of how the results fit into the broader field of study. This enhances the robustness of the manuscript. The authors present statistically analyzed data, supporting their conclusions' validity.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>It would be beneficial to include more recent studies (from the last 5 years) that focus on the cardiotoxicity of psychoactive substances, including MDMA, as well as recent advancements in histological analysis methods.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, however, there are occasional grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that should be corrected.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revisions in terms of sentence structure and clarity could improve readability. 2. The references have to be currently used and consistent throughout the manuscript <p>The study involved 25 adult albino Wistar rats, which raises ethical concerns about animal welfare. While the manuscript mentions obtaining approval from the Research Ethics Committee and adherence to WHO guidelines, further details are needed on how the ethical treatment of animals was ensured, especially in minimizing suffering during molly administration and euthanasia_ There is a lack of detail on whether alternatives to animal testing were considered.</p> <p>The description of using chloroform as anesthesia could raise concerns, as chloroform is no longer widely recommended due to its harmful effects on animals and handlers.</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:	Ravjit Kaur
Department, University & Country	CT Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, India