



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_56640
Title of the Manuscript:	Allium sativum (Garlic) Extract and Ascorbic Acid Comparatively Ameliorate Renal Parenchyma of Gentamicin-induced Nephropathic 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>TITLE -The title may be modified by removing the word “comparative” and rewritten as “Allium sativum (Garlic) Extract and Ascorbic Acid Ameliorate Renal Parenchyma of Gentamicin-induced Nephropathic Rats”. It is obvious from the results that the ameliorative effect of the extract was not compared with the standard antioxidant vitamin C.</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS (2.0) -Merge section 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7 as 2.5 Histopathological analysis -Explain how the histopathological changes in Figure 4 were assessed. Were the changes graded?</p> <p>STATISTICAL ANALYSIS (2.8) -The authors reported that the results were analysed using ANOVA with t-test, which is abnormal; t-test is not compatible for Post Hoc multiple comparison. I recommend that authors re-process the data using appropriate statistical methods/Post Hoc.</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION (3.0) -Considering the format of presentation of results and discussion of the present study, the authors may have to present the RESULTS and DISCUSSION separately, not combined.</p> <p>-Modify sections: 3.1 as “Body weight changes” 3.2 as “Absolute kidney weight” 3.3 as “Histopathological changes” - It may be necessary to place the “+ ” symbol on the bar of the “normal control” (Figure 1, 2 and 4, except in Figure 1(Beginning of the study) to indicate a significant difference (if any) as compared to the experimental control.</p> <p>COMPETING INTERESTS DISCLAIMER -The statements suggest that there is competing interests. The statements imply that there was an understanding between the researchers and the producers.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Revised the manuscript and submit for re-evaluation.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wilson Obidah
Department, University & Country	Modibbo Adama University of Technology Yola, Nigeria