



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	2012 BJPR 2172
Title of the Manuscript:	Combined oral arginine and monosodium glutamate exposure induces adverse response on the prostate and testis of rats.

General guideline for Peer Review process: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- *Is the problem/objective of this study original and important? SCIENCEDOMAIN international strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism. However, studies which are carried out to reconfirm / replicate the results of any previously published paper with new dataset, may be considered for publication. But these types of studies should have a 'clear declaration' of this matter. If you suspect any unethical practice in this manuscript, kindly write it in the report with some proof/links.*
- *Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described)*
- *Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant and current 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. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them)*
- *Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?*
- *SDI believes in constructive criticism. Reviewers are encouraged to be honest but not offensive in their language. It is expected that the reviewer should suggest the authors on how they can strengthen their paper to make it acceptable. Comments of the reviewers should be sufficiently informative and helpful to reach a Editorial Decision. We strongly advise that a negative review should also explain the weaknesses of any manuscript, so that the concerned authors can understand the basis of rejection and he/she can improve the manuscript based on those comments. Authors also should not confuse straightforward and true comments with unfair criticism.*
- *We are very much reluctant to go against suggestions (particularly on technical areas) of the reviewers. Therefore, authors are requested to treat the suggestions of reviewers with utmost importance.*
- *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 in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preparation of the testis sections should be written in "material and methods/experimental details/methodology". 2. In this manuscript, effects of GLU. ARG or MSG on the prostate and testis of rats should be investigated. 3. In this manuscript, the data is not enough to evaluate the effects of the prostate and testis of rats. More deeply researches should be carried out. 	<p>1. Blood samples were centrifuged for 10 min at 3,000g, room temperature, and the serum was stored in deep freezer for assays of biochemical parameters. Following excision, testis samples were collected immediately and fixed in 10% formaldehyde buffered saline (formal saline) for histological examination. The testis sections were stained and mounted using haematoxylin and eosin (H&E), as described earlier [35]. In brief, the testis specimens were dehydrated in graded levels of alcohol (70-100%) in ascending order to remove the water content. After dehydration, the tissues were cleared in xylene impregnated with paraffin wax and sectioned at 5 microns thickness using rotary microtone. The sections were floated on a water bath maintained at a temperature of 2-3°C below the melting point of the paraffin wax after which the sections were dried on a hot plate maintained at a temperature of 2-3°C above the melting point of the paraffin wax. After drying, the sections were stained and mounted using haematoxylin and eosin.</p> <p>2. The effect of GLU. ARG or MSG on the prostate and testis of rats was investigated and reported in this manuscript.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

		3. The authors admitted that “Further work however, is required to address some shortcomings of this study and to validate reliability».
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In this manuscript, negative and positive effects of GLU, ARG and MSG were investigated. The title should be changed to “Effects of combined oral arginine and monosodium glutamate exposure on the prostate and testis of rats”.	Combined oral arginine and monosodium glutamate exposure induces adverse response on the prostate function and testis histology of rats
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		