Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRIMPS_126339**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Evaluation of Gender-Specific Variation in Lead-Induced Nephrotoxicity in Wistar rats.**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/
Benefits for Reviewers: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers

Review Form 3

PART 1: **Review Comments**

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**I like the manuscript as lead is a part of a society and we should know how toxic it is and how it effects males and females.This will be a useful topic for discussion and well as for research purposeless is a part of society so people should know that they need to be careful about its usage and extend of usage.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Yes**	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	**Yes it is comprehensive according to my opinion.**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Yes they are.**	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**I found it quite satisfactory but there are few points I would like to highlight which shows be considered. They are: 1.Almost 60% of references used here are old for more than 5 years.Like references in introduction and discussion should be from articles published in last 5 years.Discussion part have more than 50% references which are from articles published in 2009 to 2014.Author can use old references but they should not be more than 20 to 30% of total references. 2.There are some grammatical mistskes which need to be rechecked.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	**References are sufficient but there should not be more than 25% references which are more than 5 years old. Updating new references is required in introduction and discussion**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Quite suitable but minor grammatic mistakes need correction.	
Optional/General comments	Manuscript is good and satisfactory in my opinion. Just need minor grammatical corrections and change/ upgrade references.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Amber Shami**
Department, University & Country	**Central Park Medical College, Pakistan**