



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_42640
Title of the Manuscript:	Ethanollic Seed Extract of Garcinia Kola Reduces Epididymal Sperm Count And Some Serum Reproductive Hormone Concentrations In Adult Male Albino Wistar 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://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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The name used for the substrate administered should be uniform. For example, in line 18, G. kola was used. In lines 33 and 37, Bitter kola was used, while in the title, Garcinia Kola was used. I believe one name should be used for uniformity. 2. In line 40, the method used to prepare the stock solution should be clearly stated and well referenced. 3. In line 55, I don't know what "7000g" means. If it is for measures of centrifuge revolution, it can't be in "g". 4. In line 77, there is a repetition of "when compared". The last one I believe should be removed. 5. In subsection 3.1.2, and 3.1.3, I believe that the group number e.g. Group 1, 2, 3, and 4 should be in bracket immediately after the concentration of G. kola. This will aid the reader as it will be easier to understand the groups being explained. 6. In line 117, I think the second "cholesterol" written there should be testosterone. 7. In line 118, after the third word, I think "observed in this study" should be added, to try to differentiate it from other scholarly work. 8. In subsection 3.1.2, there were reports of effects of the substrate on the testis, however, there are no micrographs to support such claims. These micrographs are very necessary. 9. Under references, the first reference has no year of publication. It only has volume and page number. 	<p>Agreed and Substrate name corrected to be in uniform</p> <p>Agreed and clearly stated and referenced</p> <p>Unit of revolution corrected</p> <p>Checked and removed</p> <p>Added in brackets</p> <p>On line 117 it is "cholesterol". Reference article is cited as evidence Checked and added on line 118</p> <p>No, only the weights of the testis and the epididymis were accessed in subsection 3.1.2, histological examinations on the testis were not carried out.</p> <p>Checked and added</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I believe the first alphabet of each word in any subheading should be in upper case. Check the subheading 3.1.1. 2. In subsection 2.2, I do think the last sentence should be removed since it was repeated under subsection 2.3 where it rightfully belongs. 	<p>Ok, checked and corrected</p> <p>Ok, checked and corrected</p>
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The research report is good and arranged well. 2. I have some concern as it regards subsection 2.2. I do believe it is necessary to correctly state the type of "normal rat pellets" given to these rats as well as the type of water they were fed with, if it was tap water, distilled water, or rain water. These things might look minor, but they are actually relevant. 	<p>Thank you very much</p> <p>Checked and corrected</p>