

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_122455
Title of the Manuscript:	Gender differences in the effects of cadmium exposure on hematological parameters in male and female Wistar rats.
Type of the Article	

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)
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Investigate the impact of cadmium exposure on hematological parameters of Wistar rats. - How can the gender dimorphism in cadmium exposure on hematological parameters Wistar rats. - Contribute to this body of knowledge 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The suggest title (Gender differences in the effects of cadmium exposure on hematological parameters in Wistar rats).	
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>The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>I suggest deleting the following sentences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cadmium is a pervasive metal with significant environmental and occupational health risks. Exposure to cadmium, through inhalation, ingestion, or dermal contact, can lead to various adverse health effects, including hematological alterations. - Hematological parameters were analyzed using an auto-hematological analyzer. Data were statistically evaluated using two-way ANOVA with significance set at $p < 0.05$. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Very 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The hypothesis is clear. - Investigate the impact of an important pollutant (cadmium). - Methodology: Good, the author accurately explain how design the exposure of cadmium on Wistar rats. The design suitable for answering the question posed. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Good	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Nothing	

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhanned Remzi Nashaat
Department, University & Country	Iraq