

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_82759
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of the Histopathological Effects of Potash on the Hearts 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:

(<https://www.journalajcr.com/index.php/AJCR/editorial-policy>)

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 Change grouping to reflect actual groups used	<p>The grouping of the rats is not clear. The author mentioned 6 groups A-E not A –F, I also noticed the missen group was used for toxicity report, So I recommend there It can be &5 rats in total. 50 were used for toxicity assessment and 25 were divide into 5 groups of 5 rats each. Or 6 groups of A –F.</p> <p>3.2 Results on Behavioural Observation</p> <p>Table 2 presents the behavioural observation of the wistar rats in the study. In the feeding, the control rats fed well and normal but the test rats had loss of appetite. The control rats passed out normal stool while the test rats passed out greyish dark colour faeces. The test rats were losing hairs as the study progresses while the control groups were normal. The test rats become inactive as the study progress while the control groups were active.</p> <p>These above cannot be reported as behavioural observation. Where behavioural studies carried out.</p> <p>Cytotoxicity of Potash on heart muscles is the main aim of the study and as such should be well described from the toxicology study to how it affects heart muscles functionality and histopathology.</p>	All the necessary corrections were done as indicated
Minor REVISION comments	Several typographical errors that need to be corrected. Toxicity process and report is not well reported	Okay
Optional/General comments	<p>material and methods / experimental details / methodology</p> <p>Arthur should follow the approved guide for the journal. I believe this might need better formatting especially with regards to the guidelines</p> <p>Choice of words and titles in some cases</p>	Done

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	