

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_77338
Title of the Manuscript:	TRAMADOL INDUCED OVARIAN AND UTERINE CHANGES IN ALBINO RAT
Type of the Article	Original study

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lac k of N o velt y**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The citation of the bibliography needs to be revised (it is not the usual one). The results and discussions should be presented as two separate chapters. The discussion part must be redone, giving the necessary amplitude requested by an original study.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The abstract is too short for an original study. The conclusions chapter contains only 3 lines, there is room for something more. The spelling in English needs to be revised, there are minor, non-essential errors.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>I read with interest a generally good manuscript, but which is not yet ready for publication. The study on which it is based seems to be above the quality of the manuscript. What struck me from the beginning is the unusual way of quoting the bibliography, the authors using instead of numbers the abbreviated title of the cited articles. It's not a mistake, but I find it difficult to index in databases. The abstract is well written, but too short for an original study. Keywords are well chosen. The introduction is good enough to keep it in its current form. Materials and methods is the best chapter of the manuscript, it contains all the necessary details to allow the reproducibility of the study. For this part of the manuscript, I congratulate the authors! The results and discussions are presented together. I would prefer these two chapters to be separated. The results are correctly and completely discussed, in the text and in well thought out tables. The discussion part is practically absent, we find only about 20 lines with reference to some bibliographic entries. It is far too little for a well-conducted study and I consider that the manuscript cannot be published in this form. The conclusions chapter contains only 3 lines, it's a shame for such a good study. The references are current, sufficient and correctly written, but incorrectly quoted in the text. The tables are good and necessary for the manuscript, they are not figures, but they are not lacking. English is good, but there are small typos that need correction. Overall, the most important deficiency of the manuscript is the discussion chapter, but this aspect seems easy to correct, considering the quality of the study and the bibliography already available.</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Laurentiu Simion</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Medicine and Pharmacy Carol Davila, Romania</b>