



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJMMR/2065
Title of the Manuscript:	A HISTOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE HEPATIC AND RENAL EFFECTS OF SUBCHRONIC, LOW DOSE ORAL MONOSODIUM GLUTAMATE IN SWISS ALBINO MICE.

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?)*
- 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)*
- 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?)*
- 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)*
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- 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)
<u>COMPULSORY REVISION</u> comments	<p>TITLE: Delete the full stop at the end of the title. Rephrase the title thus: EFFECT OF SUBCHRONIC LOW DOSE ORAL INGESTION OF MONOSODIUM GLUTAMATE ON THE HEPATIC AND RENAL HISTOLOGY OF SWISS ALBINO MICE</p> <p>ABSTRACT Did not indicate the group sample size. Assuming it is even, then include (n = 10). The conclusion should read “may cause” and not causes.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION The objective of this study is well defined in the introduction. However, the introduction is unnecessary long.</p> <p>MATERIALS & METHODS Should describe how they obtained the organs (liver and kidney) weight. The animals were not acclimatized before the start of the experiment. This is a flaw. free access to food and water <i>ad libitum</i> ? to read : ‘free access to food and water’ or ‘access to food and water <i>ad libitum</i>’</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

STATISTICAL analyses is not a must for this study if strict on histological study. However, the authors measured body weight of the rats.

All behavioral data ? Remove behavioral.

Results & discussion

Results not well presented. Actual data were not provided either in the presentation or elsewhere. This is quite confusing, as the information could not be obtained from the figure.

Should use either g or kg as unit for weight in Figure 2.

In the result presentation the authors wrote “Comparison of the final body weight with the initial body weight in each group revealed a dose related decrease in percentage weight gain in the groups that received MSG....” **But the authors did not present the initial body weight for comparison.**

“The results of our study revealed that at the doses of MSG tested, there was a dose related increase in body weight” **This is not true as shown in Figure 1, unless if the authors were not comparing their results with that of the control.**



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Should correct punctuation flaws in the abstract section and other sections.	
Optional/General comments	<p>Generally, the discussion failed to link change in body weight as well as liver and kidney weight with the histological observation. Also, some inconsistency were noted in the reference section. Should study the journal referencing style for conformity. Conclusion is not based on the data presented inside the manuscript, thus “causes” should be changed to read “may cause”</p> <p>The references cited are relevant, recent and adequate.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Egbuonu, Anthony C. Cemaluk, Ph.D.
Department, University & Country	Department of Biochemistry, University of Nigeria Nsukka, Nigeria.