

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77611
Title of the Manuscript:	Anti – Androgenic activity of Cesalpenia bonducella in androgen induced Polycystic ovarian syndrome rats
Type of the Article	Original 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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>In the abstract they mention that 5 groups were formed with six rats in each group and in the experimental model section they mention that each group had five animals</p> <p>In the hormone measurement section, the value of the inter- and intra-assay coefficient for each hormone must be mentioned.</p> <p>In the section of the histological study of the ovary, it is necessary to mention the thickness of the cuts, and it is necessary to check if the name of the dye is written correctly</p> <p>Table 2. It is more pertinent to put the name of each group, instead of putting G1, etc.</p> <p>In table 2 it says that they measured TSH, are they not referring to testosterone?</p> <p>It is necessary to standardize how they put the name of progesterone, see table 2</p> <p>They mention that in Table 3 the weight of the ovaries appears and is not seen.</p> <p>In the figure caption of the histological sections they mention that the doses of 200 and 400 are low doses</p> <p>The photographs do not allow us to observe what the authors describe</p> <p>In the discussion it is said that "After 30 days of PCO induction, animals were analysed both harmonically & histologically" Los autores se refieren al análisis hormonal?</p> <p>In reference 24, the number 103 also appears</p> <p>The discussion is very poor, there is no mention of a possible mechanism by which the extract could improve the hormonal profiles and histology of the ovary.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	In general, a very careful review of the manuscript is required	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Leticia Morales-Ledesma
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico