



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Thanks to the authors to respond to all our remarks The subdivision of the groups is still confusing This phrase "The other groups II, III which served as the experimental groups were administered with 200mg/kg and 400mg/kg of developer effluent respectively by oral gavage" means that rats were subdivided into groups II and III based on the dose of effluent they were administred, but in the next phrase we discover that II and III refer to the duration of follow up and subgroups A and B to the dose. And finally in the last phrase "After 14 days, three rats from groups I, II and III were sacrificed (using the chloroform inhalation method), while the remaining three rats in each of the groups were sacrificed after 28 days and their hearts harvested. " we discover that rats of the group III were sacrificed (which signify that the group III is not the 28 days group but the 400mg group) (We remember that the group I (control group) was administered the dose of 0mg and was sacrificed at 14 days (IA) or 28 days (IB) which further suggest that A and B refer to the duration of follow-up). We suggest to transform II and III to 200 and 400mg groups and A and B to 14 and 28 days duration of effluent administration. Line 100 same low dose (200 mg/kg or 400mg/kg) The paragraph methods should mention if the operator and observer were the same for all blades. The results should not be restricted to the description of microscopic findings and not only be the repetition of figures . authors should describe if the technique was successful in all sacrificed rats, if there was any technical difficulty, The number of rats these findings were observed (a table to describe findings in each group may be informative).....	1. We have corrected and improved on the groupings of the animals as suggested by the reviewer. We have also effected changes in all affected sections of the manuscript. 2. The observation in line 100 has been corrected. 3. As suggested by the reviewer, we have mentioned that operator and the observer were the same for all slices in the methodology. 4. We have improved on the Result section as suggested and added table of analysis.