

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77141
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of histological features of the Cerebral cortex and Hippocampus of Albino rats using Haematoxylin & Eosin stain- An Observational study.
Type of the Article	Research article

### **General guideline for 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 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**

	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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>The materials and methodology of the H and E staining is combined which needs to be separated with following headings like</p> <p><b>Materials</b> Indicates all the agents used in study and the origin/source from where it is purchased.</p> <p><b>Methodology</b> Explain in detail all the steps by step procedure for H and E staining. The reference of the methodology is missing. The method of staining needs to be cited. it is also important to discuss that on how many rats the experiment is performed if it is performed on a single animal then validity of the data is questionable. if it performed on multiple animal then why multiple images are not included in the manuscript. please elaborate.</p> <p>The result section is poorly discussed and is written in a way looks like the writer is not fully equipped with writing of result section and hence needs to be rewrite with elaborating all the aspect of histological examination in detail to provide easy understating to the reader</p> <p>In result section Figure 2 is not a good quality picture, means it is blurred and the cellular compartment is not clearly visible, The cells including stellate cells and basket cells are not properly shown, the authors needs to put up a fine image of figure 2.</p> <p>It needs to be cleared by author that why images are taken at different magnification means Figure 1 at 10X, Figure 2 at 100X and Figure 3 at 40X etc.</p> <p>Only Figure 1 and Figure 2 are cited in results Figure 3, 4, 5 .... Figure 10 are missing. please explain in detail about these Figure also to bring worth in the manuscript.</p> <p>The discussion seems to be vague and is not discussing the work done which is the main part of the manuscript and seems to be lacking the contents which makes and develop easy understating of a scientist. The discussion should be technically sound and with addressing the importance of work in reference or light of the strong referencing. At present the discussion is poor which needs to be improved by comparing the results and its importance with previously established and published work.</p> <p>The image 1 is not cited anywhere. it would be preferable to develop computer generated picture of it which seems more interesting rather than pencil drawn manual images are placed.</p> <p>Authors declared that disease free rats are utilized in the study but how it cannot be explained by images. It is important for authors to explain that how the images are readed to show that the rats are disease free having no cellular infiltration of cells</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>1. The abstract of the manuscript starts with <b>Introduction</b>. In structured abstract the abstract starts with Objective or background.</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<p>2. The study explain H and E analysis of the rat brain. but it is not mentioned that at which magnification the images were collected.</p> <p>3. The model/version of light needs to be mentioned utilized for images of H and E staining.</p> <p>4. The first sentence of the abstract isn't making a sense please correct it.</p> <p>5. In abstract <b>CA1 CA2 CA3</b> are written whose full form needs to be written once and then abbreviations are preferable approach to have an easy understating of the readers.</p> <p>6. In keywords <b>Innovative techniques</b> and <b>cresyl violet</b> is mentioned which are not written in abstract so keywords are the word which are present in your abstract</p> <p>7. In abstract instead of enclosing H and E in bracket it is best to write full form <b>Hematoxylin and Eosin.</b></p> <p>8. The intext referencing is numeric number which some points appears before and in other appears after fullstop. please follow a uniformity as per journal guidelines. Similarly an intext citation with double numbers are written as (7),(8) NEEDS to be corrected as ( 7, 8)</p> <p>9. In methodology <b>DPX</b> stand for ?</p> <p>10. The babilography of the paper is not in a uniform style, please correct it.</p> <p>11. images quality needs to be improved.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	There is extensive needs of language editing and should be done to improve the manuscript quality.	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Muhammad Faheem</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Riphah International University, Pakistan</b>