



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_28571
Title of the Manuscript:	Hepatoprotective activity of Nigella sativa oil against Antitubercular drug-induced Hepatotoxicity in 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	1. Result mentioned in the abstract is improper, need rectification. 2. Should check for grammatical errors. 3. Cite the reference in the first paragraph of introduction. 4. Author mentioned 2013 in the abstract section as the year of collection of materials and performance of study, where as in the experimental section, they mentioned 2011. 5. About the standard laboratory conditions mentioned in section 1.1, needs rectification. 6. Discussion section is more elaborated beyond the subject. It should be concise and include only relevant scientific findings from the work. 7. Author mentioned examination of liver tissues (histopathological studies) in section 1.4. it could be better if the author produces the photographs of the pathological studies.	1. Results in abstract is rectified now. 2. Grammatical errors have been corrected 3. Reference is now cited 4. The experiment was done in the year 2011 which has been corrected. 5. Standard laboratory condition has been rectified. 6. I think all are relevant findings which shows the mechanism of detoxification of these harmful drugs. 7. Pathological study was not conducted instead the liver was observed under normal microscope
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Should check for spelling mistakes. 2. Repetition of same content in the first and second paragraph of discussion section. 3. Sentence framework is relatively poor almost in entire manuscript. 4. Content regarding table 1 in result section is repeated as it is in discussion section. 5. Correction of "table 2" to "table 1" in discussion section (page 10). Similarly Correction of "table 1" to "table 2" in page 11.	1. Spelling mistakes have been corrected 2. Repetition in the first and second paragraph of discussion section has been removed and corrected 3. Sentence framework has been improved 4. Repetition of content of Table 1 in discussion section has been removed 5. Table 2 is corrected to Table 1 on page 10 and Table 1 is corrected to Table 2 on page 11
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		