SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	**MS: 2012/BJAST/1819**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EFFECTS OF INJECTED N-METHYL-N-NITROSOUREA (MNU) IN ALBINO MICE ON THE HISTOLOGY AND HAEMATOLOGY OF SELECTED ORGANS OF THE CIRCULATORY, LYMPHOID AND DIGESTIVE SYSTEMS**

General guideline: Reviewers are requested to follow these guidelines during review: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- Introduction *(Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)*: ***The introduction is not very well written.***
- Materials & methods *(Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)*: ***Methodologies in complete***
- Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?): **Partly ok.**
- Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only): **Poorly drawn**
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite? **NO**
- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)*
COMPULSORY REVISION comments	**Author has mentioned in experimental section that one animal from each group is sacrificed at the end of every four week. Data for body weight change during this period is shown in figure 1. but in histology section, duration of treatment is not mentioned. Author should mention the exact duration of treatment after which the tissues are collected for histology.** **Standard deviation is missing in body weight profile of the induced and normal rats in Fig.1.** **In Fig 1, average weight of induced mice is less than control mice, while in female it is opposite. Can author justify this point?** **In section 2.2.1, is the MNU dose used by author is the optimum dose to induce cancer? Reviewer feels that for comparing the toxicity of MNU in several organs, author should have used at least two different doses.** **From figure 2- figure 5, histology of thymus of control female mouse is compared with treated male's thymus section, which is not correct. Author should show the histology of normal male thymus.** **Author has shown several tissue abnormalities in thymus tissue sections of induced male rats e.g. lymphocyte infiltration, cytoplasmic degeneration,**	

	vacoulation etc. Are these all abnormalities occurred in same rat or it is in tissues from different rats. **Author is trying to show Nuclear Pleomorphism, multi-nucleation, lymphocyte infiltration in figures 2, 5, 7, 11 and 16, which is not clear. Author should zoom in those areas to make it more visible and convincing.**	

Minor REVISION comments	**Manuscript is prepared very carelessly. There is a lot of grammatical and typographical errors.** **English of the manuscript is very poor, especially the discussion and introduction part** **Introduction is too long and not very informative. Author should summarize it with proper background of research with exact aim of this study.** **Line no. 113-115, "the MNU….." is not clear. Author should correct the sentence.**	
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer