



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_46879
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF ETHANOLIC EXTRACTS OF SPONDIAS MOMBIN LEAVES ON PITUITARY- GONADAL AXIS OF MALE 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Line 24: this statement is incorrect. Most advanced countries do not necessarily utilize plants as their main source of health care. This statement must be corrected and clarified. If you are only citing references for one particular country, then be specific in your statement.</li> <li>• Specify the age of the rats utilized in the experiment (line 39). "Matured" is a very nonspecific measurement and as rats can be considered adults for several years, the exact age range of rats used should be included.</li> <li>• Line 47: how were the rats sacrificed? This is unclear.</li> <li>• More detail should be included regarding the drug administration. What was the final percent ethanol in the administered drug? Why was this same percent ethanol not used for the control? How was the drug administered – injection? Subcutaneous? Via pump? Please clarify your methodology.</li> <li>• The authors do not state how statistics were done – neither the method nor the software utilized. This should be included since they rely on their statistical analysis for much of their conclusion.</li> <li>• Please double check all statistics. The values presented in tables do not match with what is stated as being statistically different or the same. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The thyroid levels listed in table 1 have errors that do not overlap. How are these not statistically different than the control?</li> <li>○ What was the start weight of the rats? Were they the same across all groups?</li> <li>○ Several values in Table 2 are listed as statistically significant, yet the errors overlap values for the control: Group 3 prostate, Group 4 testis, epididymis, prostate, Group 5 prostate</li> <li>○ Several values in Table 3 are listed as not statistically significant, yet the errors are outside the values for the control: Group 2 AST, Group 3 AST, Group 4 HB, PCV, AST, ALT, ALB, Group 5 AST</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Although a few of the liver enzymes tested are discussed (lines 66-73), the only mention is of ALT, ASP, and ALP. What are the other tested items listed in Table 3? TP, ALB, CRT, UREA. All abbreviations in this table should be defined!</li> <li>• More detailed figure legends are needed to explain the treatments in Fig 1-5. Alternatively, show dosing on the figures themselves. Key areas/cell types should be pointed out using arrows in each figure, and images should be enlarged and all of the same size within each Figure.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please utilize italics whenever using the full scientific name of <i>Spondias mombin</i>. This is done incorrectly throughout the abstract.</li> <li>• Please review correct capitalization throughout the introduction.</li> <li>• SpM should be defined if this is the abbreviation you will be using throughout the manuscript. Otherwise, you should use the full plant name.</li> <li>• The conclusion is very short. Authors specify that SpM effects are limited to the pituitary and male reproductive system – however, since they only looked at males in this study they cannot rule out an effect of SpM on female reproductive tissues. Authors should clarify this statement.</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jennifer R Schroeder</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Millikin University, USA</b>