



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_23330
Title of the Manuscript:	CARDIOTOXICITY ASSESSMENT OF RADIOGRAPHIC DEVELOPER EFFLUENT IN WISTAR RATS
Type of the Article	Original Research Articles

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	Abstract: The abstract was written within the word limit (max: 300). However, the authors did not follow the sub-sections as stated in the Author's Guideline in the website, e.g. aims, sample, study design, place and duration of study, methodology, results, and conclusion. Line-8: Wistar rats or wistar rats? Line-10: Twenty young rats ... are you sure? It is advisable to divide your text into numbered sections with brief headings. For examples, 1. Introduction 2. Materials and Methods 2.1. Animals 2.2. Test Chemical 2.3. Experimental Design 2.4. Tissue Preparation 2.5. Ethical Consideration 3. Results	Abstract: 1. We have made changes in the abstract in accordance with the reviewer's suggestions. We have followed the journal's format in the structuring of the sub-sections of the abstract. 2. The spelling of Wistar has been corrected 3. We have corrected the number of rats to eight. The error was typographical. 4. We have divided the text into numbered sections as advised by the reviewer.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Introduction: This section was adequately written. However, refrain yourself from copying the exact sentences to be part of your writing although you cited the references. Use your own words to rephrase or reconstruct the ideas obtained. Materials and Methods: This section was adequately composed. For group II and III, they received the effluent via oral route. How you administered the effluent to them? Oral gavage? Results: Your results are descriptive instead of qualitative findings. You have labelled the microstructures of a normal heart. Do label the remaining four photomicrographs to show the abnormalities you have observed such as loss of myocardial fibers, edema, destruction of intercalated discs, hypertrophy of myocytes, necrosis and irregular nucleues. Never submit a photomicrograph without any label or indication. Figure legend (under photomicrograph): wistar rats or Wistar rats?	Introduction 1. We have made changes in some of the sentences in the introduction section using our own words where necessary as advised by the reviewer. Materials and methods We used the oral gavage to administer the effluent and this has been stated in the Material and Methods section. Results 1. We have improved the presentation of the results as advised to reflect qualitative findings 2. We have also labelled the other photomicrographs Figures 2-5 to indicate the observed morphological changes 3. The word Wistar has been correctly written in all affected sections.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Discussion: Do search for more updated references to support your discussion. Again, similar to Instruction, please refrain yourself from copying the sentences to be part of your writing though you cited the references. E.g. line 153-155, 163-165, 177-179, 181-184. Is there any limitation in your study? Do include this part in your discussion. Animals (Wistar rats) were used in this study. The authors have obtained ethical approval from the related institution.	Discussion 1. We have provided more updated references to support the discussion as advised by the reviewer. 2. We have corrected the sentences using our own words as much as possible in the affected lines. 3. There are few limitations and we have stated these in the Discussion section. 4. Yes, we obtained ethical approval as stated in the Methods section.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	• Acknowledgements: Funding source for this study? • References: The listed references are NOT in accordance with the style instructed by the journal. Please kindly refer to the Author's Guideline in the website. There are missing information such as the other authors' names, publishing year and pages in your references. Please check all the 21 listed references.	Acknowledgement: has been provided in the text. There was no financial assistance of any kind was received from any organization for the conduct of this research. References 1. We have listed the references in accordance with the journal's style. 2. We have provided missing names and publishing years and pages where necessary.
Optional/General comments		