



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_40313
Title of the Manuscript:	Renal and Metabolic Effects of Goutweed (Aegopodium podagraria L.) Extract Compared with Potassium Chloride in Rats Receiving Hydrochlorothiazide
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>)

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	1. Results and discussion are too long and difficult to focus. Results should be separated from discussion. You should shorten these sections. They should be written more precisely and comparatively. You should specify how potassium chloride and extract in each concentration could significantly counteract the HCTZ side effect. Ethical issue: Yes. The approval was declared in the manuscript.	Dear Reviewer, We would like to thank sincerely for the professional and rapid review of the article. We have considered your comments and made changes to the revised manuscript (changes are highlighted in yellow colour). The section "Results and Discussion" was shortened and edited, the efforts were made to write it clearly and concisely. Still the separation of the results from discussion was not possible because the attempt to do it did not lead to the reduction of the section, since the respectively small parts 3.2, 3.3, 3.5 tended to the increase after subdivision, and the whole text became even more complicated. Nevertheless, the editing was made in the other sections allowing to decrease them (in total, 1 page was cut), some sentences were transferred to the "Conclusion" section and some data were logically rearranged (P.6, P. 10, P. 11). We believe the revised manuscript is indeed more scientifically sound. We look forward to receiving your reply.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		