

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_128170
Title of the Manuscript:	Local Leguminosae Profile Of Pea Pigeon (Cajanus Cajan) In Indonesia And Its Potential On The Bone Tissue Structure Of Female Rats
Type of the Article	Scientific

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: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article is scientific and has a scientific and useful purpose... but it was not addressed whether the experimental animals were in the post-menopausal stage during the experiment or whether menopause was induced in the animals... and more than one menopausal state should have been confirmed for the animals by measuring the concentration of the progesterone hormone or making tissue sections of the ovari	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is preferable to change the title The Effect of Local Pea Pigeon (Cajanus Cajan) on The Bone Tissue Structure of Female Rats during Menopause.	
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.	Kind of good As for the doses, the dose concentration for each group was not clearly mentioned (percentage or grams per milligram) Regarding measuring estrogen levels, were they measured in serum or blood samples (please clarify) and make sure of the device used to measure them... HPLC is mentioned in the summary, while it is known that the concentration of hormones in the serum is measured using ELISA.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is scientifically	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The sources have a good degree of modernity from 2018 onwards. However, the way the sources are written is not arranged, it is not according to the alphabet nor according to the sequence of their appearance in the manuscript, and some sources are not written in the known sequence, which is the name of the scholar and the year. The title and the rest of the details	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. It is suitable	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	My best wishes for success and good luck to the researcher, the magazine and its staff.	

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:	Athraa H. Ali
Department, University & Country	Baghdad University, Iraq