

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82858
Title of the Manuscript:	ON THE BASIS OF PAS & H&E STAINS ASSESSMENT OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF NIGELLA SATIVA ON HISTOMORPHOLOGICAL VARIATIONS OF SEMINIFEROUS TUBULES IN DOXORUBICIN TREATED ALBINO 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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-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><u>Abstract</u> Kindly state what animals in the control group received</p> <p>The manuscript should be reviewed for grammatical errors, spelling mistakes and punctuation errors which are many in the write-up</p> <p><u>Introduction</u> The Introduction looks ok to me however, authors should please limit the use of "It" in the second paragraph and mention the item being referred to.</p> <p><u>Materials and Methods</u> 1. Age (in terms of weeks) and weight of rats should be mentioned 2. Treated given to animals in the control group should be stated 3. Kindly describe how the plant materials were obtained, and how extract/drug was prepared 4. Kindly include a statement on ethical approval 5. Since the whole work is based on histology, I suggest that the histological procedure should be well explained. What has been written is good enough.</p> <p><u>Results</u> 1. Micrographs of the stained slides should have been lined up together in one figure for better comparison to be made. 2. Micrographs should have been taken at the same magnification for better and unbiased comparison.</p> <p><u>Discussion</u> 1. The discussion looks good, however authors should properly reference previous studies please</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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>Mainprice Akuoko Essuman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Cape Coast, Ghana</b>