



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_46182
Title of the Manuscript:	HISTOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF PRENATAL EXPOSURE OF CRUDE AQUEOUS EXTRACT OF MORINDA LUCIDA LEAVES ON THE FRONTAL CORTEX OF GROWING 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract : What inform you the choice of the dose 64,000 mg/kg?? this is too high for consumption, italicize all Morinda lucida, Just like in the body of the work, no report on biochemical parameters carried outCheck the attached file for other correction</p> <p>Introduction: Check the attached file for other correction</p> <p>Method: The extraction method reported by the author is flaw; if this is actually what the author did, then the whole experiment is flaw. provide the botanist name and the voucher number deposited for the plant, No Statistical analysis method was reported, No method for biochemical analysis carried out, delete the table in section 2.4 and briefly explain it content (in section 2.2), Briefly elaborate the procedure for animal sacrifice, No anesthesia? No citation, no method of blood collection and serum preparation, Check the attached file for other correction</p> <p>Result and Discussion Method of results presentation is inadequate, No anova (statistical analysis) was conducted, Same result cannot be presented in table as well as in figure. Choose 1, No description of the results, No proper titles for tables and figures, The title of Tables should be placed on top of the table while that of graphs should be place below it. Although, the anova (which will tell the actual significant differences between the groups was not conducted. How does "low level of G6PDH the litters whose mothers were given the Morinda lucida during pregnancy when compared with the control" support the observation (made by the author) that "the litters in the groups given Morinda lucida leaf extract were not different from the control group in the development of their neurons as there were no alterations in their microarchitecture" Please master your results and established the link between 1 finding and the other. Check the attached file for other correction</p> <p>Conclusion Check the attached file</p> <p>References References are poorly written. Please check the journal guideline for author or download published article of the journal and follow the format</p>	<p>Authors very much appreciate the comments of the reviewers. We tried to improve the quality of the manuscript based on the thoughtful comments of the reviewers.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Check the attached file for other minor correction	
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	