

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The study definitely contributes to science, but it seems to be a repetition of many studies and is weak in terms of original value.	
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	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	<p>The aim of this study was to present the effect of chronic lead intoxication initiated on body weight, oxidative stress and biochemical parameters in male and female Wistar rats.</p> <p>The introduction does not seem to fully explain why lead affects the kidney more than other organs (introduction 2nd paragraph).</p> <p>A study from 7 years ago was given as a recent study on the effects of lead poisoning on gender (Regarding lead poisoning, recent study indicates that there are gender differences in lead absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion, as well as in the molecular mechanisms that contribute to lead toxicity. (Mitra et al., 2017).</p> <p>In the light of studies on the subject, the specific purpose of why Wistar albino rats were selected in the current study is stated (Despite existing research on general lead toxicity, there exists a significant deficiency in comprehending the exact hepatic gender-specific differences caused by lead poisoning in Wistar rats.)</p> <p>In the material method section, the week (age) of female and male Wistar albino rats is not specified; it would be appropriate to specify the week of the animals in terms of the effect on hormonal results.</p> <p>The number of study groups seems quite low; I wonder if a power analysis was done before starting?</p> <p>In section 2.3. Collection and Processing of Samples, it was written that the serum samples of the centrifuged blood were stored at 80°C, it would probably be -80°C; It would be appropriate to correct</p> <p>In the results section, which electrolytes are meant by the statement ‘the electrolyte function level in the lead alone (M) and lead alone (F) group were increased when compared to the control groups (P<0.05).’ should be written more clearly. (The detailed answer to this question is given in the discussion section instead of the results section-- .Furthermore, the study shows that administration of lead acetate cause increase (P<0.05) in the electrolyte functions (K+, Na+ , Cl- and HCO3) of the kidney when compared with their respective groups (Table 2).</p> <p>As far as I understand, biochemical parameters were not clarified by histopathological examination; Histopathological examination from kidney tissue could have given clearer results.</p> <p>There is no originality in the conclusion; general terms are used. You can predict the outcome of the work from the beginning. but still the effort spent and systematic discussion are worth reading.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and up to date	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	suitable	
Optional/General comments	<p>The aim of this study was to present the effect of chronic lead intoxication initiated on body weight, oxidative stress and biochemical parameters in male and female Wistar rats.</p> <p>The introduction does not seem to fully explain why lead affects the kidney more than other organs (introduction 2nd paragraph).</p> <p>A study from 7 years ago was given as a recent study on the effects of lead poisoning on gender (Regarding lead poisoning, recent study indicates that there are gender differences in lead absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion, as well as in the molecular mechanisms that contribute to lead toxicity. (Mitra et al., 2017).</p> <p>In the light of studies on the subject, the specific purpose of why Wistar albino rats were selected in the current study is stated (Despite existing research on general lead toxicity, there exists a significant deficiency in comprehending the exact hepatic gender-specific differences caused by lead poisoning in Wistar rats.)</p> <p>In the material method section, the week (age) of female and male Wistar albino rats is not specified; it would be appropriate to specify the week of the animals in terms of the effect on hormonal results.</p> <p>The number of study groups seems quite low; I wonder if a power analysis was done before starting?</p> <p>In section 2.3. Collection and Processing of Samples, it was written that the serum samples of the centrifuged blood were stored at 80°C, it would probably be -80°C; It would be appropriate to correct</p> <p>In the results section, which electrolytes are meant by the statement ‘the electrolyte function level in the lead alone (M) and lead alone (F) group were increased when compared to the control groups (P<0.05).’ should be written more clearly. (The detailed answer to this question is given in the discussion section instead of the results section-- .Furthermore, the study shows that administration of lead acetate cause increase (P<0.05) in the electrolyte functions (K+, Na+ , Cl- and HCO3) of the kidney when compared with their respective groups (Table 2).</p> <p>As far as I understand, biochemical parameters were not clarified by histopathological examination; Histopathological examination from kidney tissue could have given clearer results.</p> <p>There is no originality in the conclusion; general terms are used. You can predict the outcome of the work from the beginning. but still the effort spent and systematic discussion are worth reading.</p>	

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:	Z. Isik Solak Gormus
Department, University & Country	Necmettin Erbakan University, Turkiye