

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_84821
Title of the Manuscript:	HISTOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF ELIOZU DUMPSITE LEACHATE ON THE REPRODUCTIVE TRACT OF FEMALE WISTAR RATS
Type of the 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.journalarjgo.com/index.php/ARJGO/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	The abstract has to be formatted. The researcher has major revisions to be made since the document lack literature, and there is lack of clarity in the research design. The experimental design is very appropriate for this kind of study; however, the researcher did not state in the draft how data was sourced from the control group 1 and the other treatment groups, and above all how data was analysed. As stated earlier, the abstract has to be formatted. A good abstract must contain the following: purpose of the study, summary of the method, and findings. Sometimes you can add one or two recommendations. It should not be more than 250 words. The researcher has to reword the abstract to bring clarity to it. The study must add a section for literature review. This section will enable the researcher to connect his/her findings to the other researchers' findings in order to check for either consistencies or contradictions.	
Minor REVISION comments	Edit the work Make sure to follow the appropriate in-text citations and references styles (APA, etc.). The study lacks appropriate in-text citations	
Optional/General comments	Good article but needs minor revision	

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:	Augustine Adu Frimpong
Department, University & Country	Southern University and A & M College, USA