



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_24250
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIOXIDANT PROPERTIES OF MORINGA OLEIFERA OIL AND ANACARDIUM OCCIDENTALE OIL ON CADMIUM INDUCED LIVER DAMAGE IN ADULT 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. Overall, the entire manuscript is poorly written.</p> <p>2. Abstract fails to capture the major highlights of the paper. Methods are not described in the abstract at all. For example, a mention of what experiments were done and how statistical significance was achieved should be mentioned in abstract.</p> <p>3. Introduction is too vague and does not provide a clear motivation/rationale of why the authors conducted this study. There is no need to describe the two plants in depth.</p> <p>4. Methods should describe how MDA, GPx, SOD and CAT activities were measured</p> <p>5. Methods should describe the statistical analysis plan of how different groups were measured.</p> <p>6. Authors failed to provide any text on results and their significance</p> <p>7. Discussion does not have any meaningful points at all. They simply state that the activity has increased or decreased in the experimental groups. I don't see any meaningful difference between the experimental groups and control groups. The authors should explain and discuss the results a bit more in detail instead of just stating that the activities has increased.</p>	<p>We are very grateful for your constructive criticism and scientific observations. We have carefully done the necessary correction and adjustment as commented. Thanks</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		