



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	2013_I-SRR_8709
Title of the Manuscript:	Anti-proliferative Effect of Lime Juice on the Ovarian Cortex of Adult Wistar Rats (Rattus Novergicus)
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	<p>1. The structural format has to be changed.</p> <p>2. Please change the first sentence in back ground.</p> <p>3. Please add about the biological sources and various species available.</p> <p>4. Please add important chemical constituents and their biological activities with references.</p> <p>5. In material and methods please start with collection authentication and processing and then animal grouping.</p> <p>6. Please say on what basis you choose the dose. have u carried out the LD50 OR ED50 studies.</p> <p>7. Phytochemical screening must be attached minimum qualitative .</p> <p>8. check the discussion spelling.</p> <p>9. Results and discussion should be separated and more focusive, it should be reformatted as conclusion is unclear, give results in one para and the discuss with more scientific justification.</p> <p>10. Graphical data is missing, tabular representation is unscientific. please add</p>	<p>The corrections have been made accordingly as specified by the reviewer.</p> <p>The introduction has been rewriting to including the facts specified in the reviewer comments.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	11. Ethical sanction number should be mentioned.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>I felt scientific approach is missing but a good trail and discussion should be short, accurate and sweet. Its difficult and confusing.</p> <p>Please clarify ethical issue, if any</p>	