



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_40118
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation Of The Effect Of Ethanol Bark Extract Of Moringa oleifera On Reproductive Biology Of Non-Pregnant Wistar Albino Rats
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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	<p>The accession number/voucher specimen number of the herb from the Identification authority should be provided.</p> <p>The protocol approval number from the Ethical committee for animal experiments should be mentioned in the text.</p> <p>Authors should justify the conclusions of this study as the results have no significant effects on normal female rats. When acute administration doesn't show any effects, why the study not conducted for a long time?</p> <p>Chronic effects should have been studied.</p> <p>Authors failed to justify the goodness of this plant and its correlation with the present study. It seems a study conducted on this plant just to see the effect on reproductive hormones.</p> <p>Ethanol extract was not studied for its chemical composition. How would the authors correlate their activity to the chemical components?</p> <p>It is very possible that the ethanol soluble phytoconstituents have no effect but other constituents soluble in water, petroleum ether or chloroform may have different effects on the same parameters.</p> <p>Authors only tried a single extract instead they could have tried successive solvent extraction and got different extracts from the same plant material. This would have increased the area of study as well as enriched this paper a lot.</p> <p>I would suggest the authors to perform some other studies as mentioned above and compare the effects with the present results. That may provide a fruitful conclusion.</p> <p>Recommendation- MAJOR REVISION</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alok Nahata
Department, University & Country	Malaysia