



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_18069
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphological Changes in the Testis of Rattus norvegicus Exposed to Cigarette Smoke
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The ms is interesting, it mentions other similar works. Introduction is related to reports in mice, even though authors cite reports on rats in the references. Methods: Statistics, it should be written Student's <i>t</i> test. Results and Discussion: Figure 1 does not correspond with the text, it should be mentioned as Scheme1. Then Chart 1 should be replaced by Figure 1, and the X axis should be written in English. There is no Figure 2 cited in the text, but there is an image without any caption, nor number. Results are duplicated. i.e., Chart (figure) 1 and in the second paragraph of this section. There is no discussion of the data, and the researchers mention others' works with a different set of results and they imply that it did occur in this study. Some references in the text and in the section are in capital letters.	Thank you for the suggestions. We sent it back without changes in discussion, because we understand that the discussion about the theme, about the data should be based on literature already published. Our experiment just proved that there was an atrophy in the epithelium. After that, it was time to look for the literature, and try to discuss with it, comparing our results to other researches, that maybe help us to explain our results. We are able to know more about this, and to discuss more with you. Thank you very much!
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		