



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The authors reported that combined oral arginine and monosodium glutamate exposure induces adverse response on the prostate and testis of rats . As a matter of fact the study is appropriately designed, and statistical analysis seem appropriate. The main limits of the paper is that, as a matter of fact, the size of sample is too small , and the discussion is poor, furthermore, the histomorphological changes in the testis sections of group 2 and group 5 should be provided. The pictures were not taken by the histopathologist. According to him, he needed not to take all the pictures to write his report.</p> <p>In addition, PAP activity in serum significantly decreased in group 4 and group 5, but why TAP activity hane no obvious change.</p> <p>The rise in the serum TAP and PAP activities could be reflective of adverse response on the prostate glands functionality, why This may be so since the elevation of serum level of these bio-markers was associated with prostatic cancer [26,27,28,44]. Thus, prostate dysfunction possibly induced by exposure to ARG, GLU or ARG+MSG may have resulted in the increased</p>	<p>Further work however, is required to address some shortcomings of this study and to validate reliability.</p> <p>The pictures were not taken by the histopathologist. According to him, he need not take all the pictures to write his report.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>TAP and PAP levels noted in this study.</p> <p>histomorphological changes inconsistent with biochemical changes in group 4 and group 5? This point must be recognized and better discussed. Oddly, the histomorphological changes were inconsistent with the biochemical changes in Group 4 (MSG) and Group 5 (ARG+GLU), but histomorphological changes were more definitive response following agent treatment in animals [35].</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Line 104-106 is confusing. "On the other hand, TAP activitybut ($p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$) in those exposed to ARG combined with MSG (Group 6)" This paragraph is confusing. Re written</p> <p>Line 22 change "arginine" to "arginine (ARG)" Line 27 change "glutamate" to "glutamate (GLU)" Line 32 change "MSG" to " monosodium glutamate (MSG)" Corrected</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The manuscript needs to be better written.</p> <p>In the Tables, whenever you report p-values please report in the caption of the Table which statistical test you have performed.Corrected</p>	