



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_45068
Title of the Manuscript:	A comparative Evaluation Of Selected Medicinal Plants For Possible Use As Male Anti Infertility Agents. An Animal Case Study.
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>ABSTRACT- Too long need to revise Line 13:Ninety sexually matured Albino rats (11 groups) The number is not tally with Line18 that is 10 rats/group and 110/11 groups Line 22: infected groups..... search for better word to replace 'infected' Result for estradiol, testis histology and sperm profile are not reported in this Abstract Keyword: fertility agent What is meant by fertility agent Keyword must include testis histology</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS Line 73:and milled...search for better word to replace 'milled' Line 74: Check the number of rats used in this experiment Line 76 and 104:.....28-31oc.... 'oc' is not properly written Line 81:.....why rats in.....what is 'why' Line 88 – 97: Group 3:.....between (bw)...what is 'between' Line 109:and test weight...what is 'test' Line 129 – 132: Need to rephrase Line 134:and liver.... There is no result on liver Need to write subtitle on Statistical Analysis</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Line 160 – 161:non-significant (p> 0.05) Non-significant 'difference' (p>0.05) Table is not properly written – no unit, no mean±SD, no number of rats Table must be self-explanatory Line 166 – 174: Group 3:the powdered test substance the powdered test substance (delete for all) Testis histology results are not reported in this section Need to write discussion of the result in comparison to other studies and justification of the results</p> <p>REFERENCES References in the text are not properly written need to check References listed in the References section are not according to instruction to the Author of the Journal References are outdated (the latest journal that cited was 2010). Need to get latest journal as references</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The overall manuscript is not well written	

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Authors need to obtain ethic approval to conduct the research</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Noor Hashida Hashim
Department, University & Country	University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia