



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	-Abstract is not clear. Authors need clarify description of experimental groups. -What means induced control (group B) and Group A = normal control? Line 15 mention thar group A receive 3 mg/Kg b.w. of 0.9% NaCl, authors need explain. -Materials and Methods section is not clear. In addition, does not understand in the same way that abstract section. -Procedures as sacrificed, brain tissue homogenization and handle of samples for histochemistry assay were not indicated. -Is important indicate de basic fundament of the kits employed for biochemistry assays. -Results were not described and methodology is unjustified. -Graph presentation is poor and redundant to the tables presented.	Abstract has been reviewed for clarification as indicated This part has been reviewed for clarification This part has been reviewed for clarification Basic details have been included; standard protocols when used are not supposedly included word for word especially if they have universal standard protocols Basic details have been included Further details are inserted Graphs are being presented in simple understandable forms devoid of unnecessary ambiguity; but could further be format during publishing; the choice of chart are the most suitable fr such



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-Authors need justified antioxidant determinations in different biological samples (serum vs brain tissue). What means these results? -Discussion section presents several typographic mistakes in addition to argue the study findings. Is more a results section than discussion. Authors need indicate is animals handle was approved by any ethical committee.	presentation; otherwise we shall need specific instructions or suggestions Corrections are being effected Ethical approval was obtained; it is a standard procedure [for us here] when a research is conducted in an institutional facility
Minor REVISION comments	-Nomenclature of IARC is not applied correctly. -Materials and methods need indicate if animals of group A were sacrificed after 3 weeks, as all others animals. -Reference nomenclature of the text is confused.	Corrections have been effected
Optional/General comments	Manuscript is not suitable for publication in the actual version. There are many presentation details to be attended immediately. Principally is difficult understand the experimental design. Group description by letters is not clear, need change or describe correctly and congruent between manuscript sections.	Manuscript has been reviewed for clarifications