



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. the definition of the groups is confusing the group II and III are defined according to the dose , lign 89-90, for 14 days administration the groups IIA and IIIA (and not IIA and IIB) The results should be detailed and not restricted to the description of the 4 figures The figures should be informative by themselves (describe the dosage and the period rather than the designation of the group (or both) and describe the abnormalities lign 163 interventricular wall is the septum cardiac hypertrophy is defined as an increase in cardiac mass rather than a type of remodelling or wall thickening references should be improved, some of them checked for the form	1. We have defined the groups accordingly, see Experimental design section. 2. The groupings have been well defined in the Experimental design section. 3, The results have been presented more appropriately as advised. 4. We have redefined cardiac hypertrophy as advised 5. We have made corrections in the Reference section where necessary as suggested.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The subject is of interst, the paper is original, but the description of the results only as 4 figures seems insufficient, the bibliography should be optimized with newer papers. The abstract lacks accuracy	