SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

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**

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)

SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: 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)*
General comment:	The article could have been more closely proof read prior to submission for publication. The attention to detail in formatting the Reference section citations sends up the "red flag" for this reviewer.	
Specific comments:	The authors' needed to provide more details in the Materials and Methods (MM) and Results sections.	
Title and abstract	The Title and Abstract are adequate.	
Introduction *(Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)*	The Objective stated in the Introduction is defined for the reader.	
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	The references appear adequate; however, see "Reference" section for comments.	
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)*	The reviewer cannot determine if the Control animals were sham injected with 0.9% sodium chloride or left completely un-injected in the study.	
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?)	The reviewer cannot determine how many animals were available for the statistical analysis at each of the respective time points. The "N" numbers are not clearly stated for the Weight and the Clinical Pathology analysis and the Tables do not have enough foot noted information to guide the readers through some of details. One can ascertain from line 118, that one mouse from each group was sacrificed for microscopic evaluation. This is an inadequate "N" for each one of seven time points for the determination of microscopic changes over a 28 week study. Additionally, given a 28 week study, each group at the end of the study contained 13 mice. What was the fate of these animals? Were they necropsied and the information tabulated in the study?. One infers that these animals were not microscopically evaluated. A table containing the microscopic findings would have been beneficial and aided the readers in seeing the changes across groups. One suspects, however, that there were not enough animals evaluated microscopically at each time point to provide this information in such a format.	

	Photomicrographs. There are 22 photomicrographs which are more than necessary to convey the authors' findings and should be reduced to possibly one/two per organ. The resolution in the examined copy is very poor and the changes in the captions are not discernible from the images. One cannot confidently identify the changes referenced in the captions. The magnification listed for each image may/or may not be correct. Figure 19 would be an example of an error in magnification. Additionally, not all captions list the magnification.	
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	The reviewer did not recognize any issues.	
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)	The number of mice inferred from the MM for microscopic evaluation is too few to support much of the conclusion, specifically the sentence beginning in line 423 and ending in 425.	
References	The formatting of the references is variable and inconsistent between citations. This reflects an absence of attention to detail on the part of the authors and does not reflect positively on the work. As an example compare 450, 478, 494, 496, 501 and 504 for citation formatting.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer