



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJPR_8980
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of low radiation dose on cisplatin induced hepato- testicular damage in male rats.</b>
Type of the 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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The subject is topical and of practical importance. The manuscript is well-written, and the results obtained are above suspicion.</p> <p>I have, however, a couple of remarks.</p> <p>1) In the formula giving the content of metals in the tissues studied – I think the authors have missed the volume of the AAS sample as a multiplier in the right hand expression. <i>i. e.</i>, the formula should be: Metal content in the tissue <math>[\mu\text{g/g}] = c \cdot v \cdot n / m</math>, where: <math>c</math> <math>[\mu\text{g/ml}]</math> is the concentration of the metal measured in the AAS sample of volume <math>v</math> <math>[\text{ml}]</math>, <math>n</math> is the dilution factor (how many times the initial volume of the sample had been diluted towards to the measured sample), and <math>m</math> <math>[\text{g}]</math> is the mass of the tissue taken. In the formula given by the author, the dimensions of the quantities in left and right are not ballanced.</p> <p>2) Using so many digits for the data is naïve; the number of digits of the quantity should conform with the magnitude of its standard deviation. Some examples:  <math>205.6 \pm 34.96</math> should be written as <math>206 \pm 35</math>;  <math>38.58 \pm 2.060</math> – as: <math>39 \pm 2</math>;  <math>3.450 \pm 0.4913</math> – as <math>3.4 \pm 0.5</math>;  <math>0.2167 \pm 0.0459</math> – as <math>0.22 \pm 0.05</math> <i>etc.</i></p> <p>The excess of digits is meaningless from statistical point of view.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I recommend the manuscript suitable for publication after minor revision ( <i>vide supra</i> ).	

**Note: Anonymous Reviewer**