



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</a>
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>)



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EBMO preparation process is not clear at all. Specify in text. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was EBMO dissolved in distilled water as well?</li> </ul> </li> <li>It is not clear how treatment was administrated. Specify in text. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not clear how EBMO treatments were given, was it by gavage needle?</li> <li>In the Study Design part it is not clear how long the rats were treated with EBMO</li> </ul> </li> <li>In table 1, p-values are showed, indicating non-significant differences, but in Materials and Methods, Statistical Analysis, it says that Post hoc tests were employed. I assume that, given non-significant p-values were obtained; no post hoc tests were applied. In that case, it should be reformulated the sentence and stating a conditional usage of post hoc tests in case of a <math>p &lt; 0.05</math>.</li> <li>As it says in lines 110-112, there is a decrease in progesterone and estrogen levels with a higher dose of EBMO. It should be considered to perform a linear regression for those cases.</li> <li>In line 121 it is mentioned that inflammatory cell infiltrations are observed in the different structures. Nonetheless, in Materials and Methods it is not clear how this was done and the figures that are supposed to show the immune infiltrations, is not clear the presence of those cells. Images must be change for ones in which immune cells are clear. On the other, also in line 121 it says <b>Varying degrees</b> of inflammatory cell infiltrations. The way this was <b>quantified</b> and compared (statistical analysis) must be added to <b>Materials and Methods</b> and an additional <b>Table</b> comparing them in <b>Results and Discussion</b>.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>After the rotary evaporator step, there was any residual ethanol in the extract or all of it evaporated?</li> <li>In line 94 it says: dehydrated with <u>descending</u> grades of alcohol. Instead of descending it should be <u>ascending</u>.</li> <li>It is not clear which AccuBind Assay Kits were employed for each hormone. Specify.</li> <li>In line 102 says that Post hoc tests were done. Specify which ones in text.</li> <li>In line 104 it says that a "p" <u>equal or less</u> than 0.05 was considered significant. It should not say "equal".</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Although the paper is simple on it execution, it is clear about the objectives and how to solve them. Nonetheless, the paper reports results that are not contemplated in Materials and Methods (see point <b>5</b> in Major Revisions).	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Diego Alejandro Fano Sizgorich</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Department of Biological and Physiological Sciences, Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Peru</b>