



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_42992
Title of the Manuscript:	Tetracarpidium conophorium and ascorbic acid enhances some male reproductive hormones in cimetidine and citrus aurantifolia treated albino 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Title</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The title need to reflect <b>male</b> albino Wistar rats. This is because the study is based on male rats.</li> </ol> <p><b>Abstract</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use <i>Citrus aurantifolia</i> and <i>Tetracarpidium conophorium</i> consistently. <u>Do not</u> alternate between species names and common manes (lime and walnut). Same for the rest of the document.</li> <li>Write out FSH in full.</li> <li>Sub-group<sub>2</sub> – is undefined. Thus reader does not know what this sub-group represents or consists off. Define/describe.</li> <li>“...affects fertility negatively having a mild effect at low doses.” This study did not do low dosages (only high and medium), thus cannot imply low dosage.</li> </ol> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs to be totally redone, because nothing is stated about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Citrus aurantifolia</i> and <i>Tetracarpidium conophorium</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ethnobotanical use as related to fertility treatment in males</li> <li>Phyto/Biochemistry of these 2 species as related to male fertility</li> </ul> </li> <li>Male fertility problems – seeing that male rats were tested</li> <li>LH</li> <li>FSH</li> <li>Issues about male fertility in Nigeria (problem statement)</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><b>Materials and Methods</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicate why low dosage has not been included in this investigation.</li> <li>Do not replicate numbers in text and numerical format, i.e. eighteen (18)</li> <li>Line 40: “200 ml of distilled water was added to it <u>and allowed for 24 hours...</u>” – bad grammar (allowed for what?).</li> <li>No justification for using Cimetidine and Ascorbic Acid.</li> <li>Line 89: “...they were anesthetized using chloroform...” ETHICS!!!! – This paper must clarify the ethical aspects of this study.</li> <li>Many results in this section, i.e. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Line 131:” all nine mice were alive”</li> <li>Line 143</li> <li>Line 144</li> <li>Line 148</li> </ul> </li> <li>Line 134: Tainter and Miller – reference needed</li> </ol> <p><b>Results</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Line 155 indicates <b>3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>, however, results are presented first under 3.1 and discussion under 3.2. This is abnormal and very unusual. Normally if results and discussion are combined, then a result is presented and immediately discussed, before another result is presented and discussed. Otherwise, Results has its own main heading (3. RESULTS) and Discussion its own (4. DISCUSSION) – this must be rectified in line with standard practices.</li> <li>All figures are indicated as Figures not figures</li> <li>No abbreviations allowed in headings (e.g. FSH or LH)</li> <li>Line 167/8: “...Aqueous Extract of <i>Tetracarpidium Conophorum</i>,...” should read “...aqueous extract of <i>Tetracarpidium conophorum</i>,...” Why capitalisation of words? This is a recurring problem throughout this paper. (see Treated vs treated in results section)</li> <li>Quality of figures is generally very poor. A dedicated program (Excel? SigmaPlot?) to be used.</li> </ol>	<p>Added as Reviewed</p> <p>Done as reviewed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Done as reviewed</li> <li>Sub groups defined as reviewed</li> <li>Error corrected</li> <li>Introduction redone as recommended.</li> <li>As designed by the supervisor of this research Assoc. Prof. Okon Uduak Akpan, Low dose treatments were not included due to the fact that it may not have profound effects on the parameters to be measured at the end of the experiment rather High dose and medium doses were preferred for optimum results.</li> <li>Done as recommended</li> <li>Corrected</li> <li>Dosages of Cimetidine and Ascorbic acid were designed based on previous researches.</li> <li>Omission acknowledged and corrected</li> <li>Reviewed and corrected</li> <li>added as reviewed</li> <li>Reviewed and corrected</li> <li>corrected as reviewed</li> <li>Done as reviewed</li> <li>Done as reviewed</li> <li>Done as reviewed</li> </ol>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p><b>19. Discussion section in serious need of sub-headings, which correspond with those of results and of materials and Methods.</b></p> <p><b>20.</b> Line 264/5: “Similar results have been reported by Wang <i>et al</i>[5] using single blood samples, others <del>have</del> found no significant change in basal FSH and LH during cimetidine therapy [6,7,8].” Why did others not find what you found? Clarify.</p> <p><b>21.</b> et al. <u>not</u> et al <u>not</u> et al, <u>not</u> al et <u>not</u> et. al - all these wrong iterations occur in this paper.</p> <p><b>22.</b> Line 278: “Lime is said to have anti-fertility effect” – who stated this? Reference needed</p> <p><b>23.</b> Line 287/8: “...component [15] whose effect can synergistically or singly enhance the biosynthetic processes underlying hormonal production.” – who stated this 2<sup>nd</sup> part of the sentence? – reference needed.</p> <p><b>24.</b> 24: line 308: replace slightly with limited</p> <p><b>25.</b> Line 320: cross reaction? Are your referring to a synergetic action?</p> <p>Line 326/329 Vit C vs Vitamin C – be consistent in presentation.</p>	Done
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <p>“This study aims to comparatively investigate the effects of Cimetidine, Ascorbic acid (Vit C), <i>Citrus aurantifolia</i> and <i>Tetracarpidium conophorium</i> on <del>male</del> fertility hormones in adult male albino wistar rats.” – grammar generally poor throughout this paper.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		