



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_29211
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro impact assessment of aqueous extract of Sida cordifolia Linn. upon rat spermatozoa parameters
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	For the discussion, what is the relation between the aqueous fraction used in this study and other fractions? Have other fractions been used before?	In this study the aqueous extract of <i>Sida cordifolia</i> was used because this plant has been prescribed to patients as a rejuvenator and tonic in the aqueous form of powder of the root of this plant for a long period in Ayurveda or traditional system of medicine. But it has not been evaluated about its possible impact on the spermatozoa in in vivo model till now - whether it will have spermicidal effect or not. Therefore, the aqueous extract of this plant was evaluated and extraction was done in soxhlet apparatus following the different solvent systems as per Ayurvedic pharmacopeia. No other fraction has been used in this study.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<i>Sida cordifolia</i> in line 57 should be italicised.	Complied as per Comments.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Good work. Very useful illustrations.	Thank you Sir/ Madam. You have recognized my original research work.