



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_JAMPS_16310
Title of the Manuscript:	Positive Anti-Cadmium Poisoning Anti-Oxidant Effects of Moringa Seed Oil and Cashew Nut Oil in Juvenile Wistar Rats Hippocampus
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors aimed to investigate the combination of anti-oxidant effect of Moringa and Cashew nut oil on cadmium oxidative stress induced rats. The experimental design should contain more control such Moringa treated group and Cashew nut group. The results of cd oxidative stress induced rats are not significant value of group B comparing to A normal group. Page 1 line22- 24 and Page 7 line 134-141 were invalid describe. Authors show figure 1 with no mention? In appropriate type of graph and statistic. This paper is poorly written.	Suggestion is greatly appreciated; a keen look at the rationale between Groups A, B and C suggests that this is being considered and taken care of in the Grouping; also, the report simply follows our research design, taking into consideration our goals and scope of research Noted ... report is focused on illustrating our goals and meeting the rationales Noted ... [though the reviewer's here comment is not quite clear] the article has been carefully reviewed Review has been made Noted ... graphs and statistics were selected to provide effective yet unambiguous result presentations; reviewer might have suggested specifically better alternatives for our consideration should such be suitable for our purpose and rationales Noted ... the article has been carefully reviewed for greater clarity and quality of expression
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		