



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJPR_20418
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of preventive effectiveness of Nigella sativa L. against rat kidney stones, generated by ethylene glycol
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 (<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>)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The paper is very poorly written in terms of language and grammar. Although this by itself should not form a basis for assessing the merit of the paper, however, in the present case I feel that it is very difficult for the reader to understand.</p> <p>It is recommended that the authors rewrite the article with some language help, and resubmit.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Monash University, Malaysia