



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_21835
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF RESVERATROL ON RELATIVE ORGAN WEIGHTS, BLOOD LEAD LEVELS, SERUM KIDNEY FUNCTION AND ELECTROLYTES LEVELS IN LEAD-INDUCED TOXICITY IN MALE 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<i>Abstract</i> - Line 20 and 22: there is a mistake: No significant ($P < 0.05$) difference in.... It should be: Significant ($P < 0.05$) difference in... or: No significant ($P > 0.05$) difference in.... <i>Discussion</i> - Line 2010/2011: The position 37 of references is recall in improper context, because this work is devoted human study but not LD50 test. Ethical issue: There is lack an Ethical Committee agreement for animal study. It is only the statement that it was conducted according to the Ahmadu Bello University research policy.	All the correction has been effected by the author's has directed by the reviewer. The corrections are highlighted in yellow colour. Thanks for the quick acceptance of the manuscript and waiting to hear from you as quick as possible for the publication procedures.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<i>Abstract</i> - The methodology is written very detailed. The detailed information is in Methodology section. Abstract should include an abbreviation. Instead of this it would more desirable to indicate supposition of the work - why authors expect that resveratrol will exert positive effect in lead poisoning. <i>Introduction</i> - In my opinion too much attention is devoted to history and general (text-book) knowledge of lead poisoning, while the main question is: is the problem of lead poisoning still current; introduction should focus on current schedule of treatment. The authors devoted one sentence to this topic – “The major treatments approaches are; the removal of the source of lead and chelation therapy (administration of agents that bind lead so it can be excreted).” By the way: is the removal of the source of lead the major treatment approach”? – line 59-61. What is	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	a basis of thesis that resveratrol could be better than current used chelators? Chemical structure? Chelator activity in vitro? <i>Material and Method</i> - Does the resveratrol using as prophylactic agent is proper? – Could it reflect real situation? It means that we can predict lead poisoning <i>per os</i> and to avoid toxic effects we used before intoxication resveratrol. If we can predict intoxication it will be more practical to avoid intoxication.	
Optional/General comments	<i>Title</i> – should be shorter, if it is possible.	EFFECT OF RESVERATROL ON SOME BIOCHEMICAL PARAMETERS IN LEAD-INTOXICATED MALE WISTAR RATS