



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_29269
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF CARDIOPROTECTIVE PROPERTIES OF AQUEOUS AND ETHANOLIC EXTRACTS OF ENTANDROPHRAGMA ANGOLENSE, COLA NITIDA AND GOMPHRENA CELOSIOIDES AGAINST DOXORUBICIN-INDUCED CARDIOTOXICITY IN RATS
Type of the Article	Original manuscript

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. Interesting work, but no evidence of cardioprotection. The authors should revisit the title and emphasis. For this reviewer, the extracts have an effect on CV markers, rather than cardioprotection. 2. The results section is rather long and can be easily shortened. The role of resveratrol, being such a novel topic, does not add much to the paper. Consider removing data on resveratrol and placing emphasis on the extracts. 3. A table presenting body weight, heart-liver-kidney weights, (instead of figures) as well as the organ to body weight ratios and weight gain would be easier to follow. Ethical issues: There is no indication whether rats were cared for according to the recommendations of the NIH or Helsinki guidelines (or Institutional Research and Animal Care guidelines).	1. The title was improved website taking into account your remarks 2. The effect of the extracts is compared with that of resveratrol 3. A table of 3 entered: body weight, heart weight and relative weight of the Heart. We had thought .But this table is overloaded when we introduce the symbols significant differences. Page2-3, line 80 to 81. The question of ethics was addressed in the revision of the manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Figures can be improved for clarity. For figure symbols, use letters, instead of ###. 2. Present the experimental groups in table form, rather than listing. 3. Rationale why the concentration of DOX used should be mentioned. Is the dose of DOX representative of the clinical setting? 4. First statement of Discussion needs a reference.	1. * P <0.05; ** P <0.01; *** P <0.001: significantly different from the batch NC. # P <0.05; ## P <0.01; ### P <0.001: significantly different from the batch PC. Use letters instead of these symbols could overload the figures. 2. 3. 8mg / kg body weight is the concentration of doxorubicin injected to rats in the thirteenth day of the experiment. 4. This recommendation was taken into account in the revision of the manuscript. Page 13 , line 312
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, the paper is generally well-written. Still room for improvement. Hopefully, JAMPS will provide some editorial assistance on sentence structure.	