



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_49605
Title of the Manuscript:	CEREBRAL CORTICAL DAMAGE IN ADULT WISTAR RATS FOLLOWING ALUMINIUM CHLORIDE ADMINISTRATION
Type of the 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>Line 148: the comparisons between groups should not be 2/2, they should be in block and, in this case use only anova one way. If a significant difference occurred, use a pos-test to know which groups differed between them</p> <p>Lines 183, 184 and 185: the meaning of the acronyms should be written in full in the title of the table.</p> <p>Line 192: What is the value of p.</p> <p>Line 197: the meaning of the acronyms should be written in full in the title of the figure 2.</p> <p>Missing Important information.</p> <p>In fig 2 "changes in SOD, MDA and SDH should be changed by" mean and standard deviation "</p> <p>There are contradictions between the results shown in table 1 and what is described in the summary. There were significant differences in the weight and the brains between the groups?</p> <p>Description of results is unclear.</p> <p>In Figure 1: Remove the group indication on the right side of the graph; Remove the title that exists on the chart; To change grams by mean and standard deviation.</p> <p>To correct the way of placing references.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 10: what is "drinking water"?</p> <p>Line 13: the word "grouped" is repeated.</p> <p>Lines 30 and 31: write the name of the enzymes in full and put the acronyms in brackets the first time they appear.</p> <p>Line 45: withdraw "Gupta et al. 2005".</p> <p>the introduction is too long</p> <p>Lines 139,141 and 143: ml and not mls.</p> <p>Lines 151 and 152: explanations about the meaning of p are unnecessary.</p> <p>Line 158: the title of table 1 needs to be improved: remove the word "showing", put the first letter of each word in lower case and put the duration of the experiment.</p> <p>Tables are formatted incorrectly.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Euclides Maurício Trindade Filho</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Núcleo de Ciências Biológicas, Brazil</i>