



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_67672
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF D-ALLETRIN BASED MOSQUITO'S COIL ON THE LUNGS, AND SELECTED HAEMATOLOGICAL PARAMETERS OF ADULT WISTAR 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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



[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>The manuscript "Effect of D-alletrin based mosquitos coil on the lungs, and selected haematological parameters of adult wistar rats" this work is worth publishing. However, it must first be modified in an important way. For example, the Background of the study must be completely rewritten as many paragraphs are repeated during this section. Phrases like "Mosquito coils are slow-burning devices which emit smoke prevent to malaria, a disease of wide distribution" is the same as what is written in the abstract, the same for phrases "mosquito coil are preferred antimosquito product African countries including Nigeria", Mosquito coils are often used overnight small particles "and" Epidemiologic studies also shown that in children (7, 9, 10) these sentences are repeated verbatim within this section. I also suggest to define the meaning of VOC's that I imagine is volatile organic compounds. In relation to the materials and methods I must point out that they should also be written in a more clear and precise way. In addition, in many parts of the text there are phrases in the future (will be) and the paragraphs continue in the past, it is not understood. In the estimation of haematological indices section the word indices is misspelled, please check. In the experimental design section, it would be more practical to order the treatments in a table. In addition, the WBC formula must be worked on in a better formula editor. Then, with respect to the statistical analysis, the authors point out that the Fischer test was used, I ask why this test was used, what results are obtained with a more conservative test like Tukey's?. In Table 1 is the t-value uppercase or lowercase? please uniform. In the description of the results in table 1, it is pointed out that there is a significant difference in group A, I am not in agreement, a p value of 0.058 would indicate that there is no difference, assuming that a test as sensitive as Fischer was used. In the whole text analysis of variance (ANOVA) is named please only leave ANOVA. The discussion seems appropriate. however, some of the ideas presented must be developed in depth. for example the paragraph "On the body weight, it was observed of the same nature (11, 12).</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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:	Manuel Chacón-Fuentes
Department, University & Country	Universidad de La Frontera, Chile