



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_46509
Title of the Manuscript:	Haematologic and Gastric Histological Changes Associated with Administration of Ground Nutmeg (<i>Myristica fragrans</i>) Seed on Adult Male Albino Wistar 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	The research article is a publishable article, the research work is germaine . The abstarct is too lengthy , the statistical analysis is not too clear since 20 rats is used and no replication is done and a one way analysis is used how is the data analysed. The result is well discussed if clarification is made and the minor correction effected it can then be published.	Noted. The number of words used in the abstract had been reduced. It did not exceed 300 words in length as stipulated in the general guide line for authors. The number of rats used in this research is 30 and not 20.
Minor REVISION comments	if clarification is made and the minor correction effected it can then be published.	Noted.
Optional/General comments	The paper is a publishable research work	Noted.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	There are no ethical issues in this manuscript.