



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_12680
Title of the Manuscript:	Anti-Obesity Effects on Unripe Rubus coreanus Miquel Extract in High Fat Diet-Induced Obese Mice
Type of the Article	Short Communication

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Major Revisions Materials and Methods (lines 73-77): These lines should be removed as they repeat exactly what is described in section 2.1 Preparation of unripe and ripe <i>R. coreanus</i> extract. Materials and Methods (line 88): The authors should provide an in-text reference demonstrating Orlistat is a recognized positive control for inhibiting fat accumulation in differentiated 3T3-L1 adipocytes. Materials and Methods: The authors should provide number of well/plate replicates used for each of the in vitro experiments. These can be included in the body of the Methods section, or in each figure legend. Results (lines 140-142): The authors claim that there is a dose-dependency of RC and uRC to decrease fat content of cultured adipocytes, however the authors do not describe significant differences between respective treatments of RC and uRC. The authors should include statistical results from pairwise comparisons assuming significant ANOVA findings. Pairwise comparisons should be indicated in the Figures by the use of a unique symbol such as †. These analyses and symbols should be described in the methods and in the corresponding Figure legends. Results Figure 1.: The images of each bar graph appear blurred with multiple error bars distorted. Additionally, is there a reason the authors have not included cell viability data? The authors should include this data as an additional panel as Figure 1D so that readers may view MTT assay findings. Results Figure 2.: Is there a reason only one dose	Materials and Methods (lines 73-77): As you suggested, we removed the sentence. Materials and Methods (line 70): As you suggested, we added reference(line 70). Materials and Methods: We did include the number of well/plate and mice in the section 2.2 and 2.5 of Material and Methods. Results (lines 140-142): As you suggested, we did describe significant differences between respective treatments of RC and uRC in one figure (Fig 1(B)). We also described pairwise comparisons between RC and uRC in Figures 1B by the use of a unique symbol of #. Results Figure 1.: As you suggested, we drew a new graph including error bar in Fig 1. And we added MTT assay in Fig1(C). Results Figure 2.:



SDI Review Form 1.6

(30µg/ml) has an inset image? These inset images should be included for each dose including controls.

Results (line 167): The in-text references to p-values in this sentence are unclear. The authors state respective p-values but there are not enough p values listed to describe each finding. The authors should re-write this sentence for clarity.

Conclusion: The authors mention the importance of identifying candidate chemicals which may be responsible for the reported benefits of *RC*. Do the authors have any speculation as to which chemicals may possess anti-obesity effects? Additionally, the authors show that *RC/uRC* may be beneficial for weight loss in obese mice, but do not describe the effects of *RC/uRC* on normal weight mice. Do the authors believe consumption of *RC/uRC* will only stimulate weight loss in obese animals? Moreover, Table 1 shows that there is a significant reduction in epididymal and perirenal fat, however this discrepancy with high-fat-fed controls only accounts for about 30% of the observed weight loss. Do the authors believe that the remainder of un-described weight loss is also adipose mass, or is it conceivable the reduction in body mass had other origins (i.e. muscle or bone)? The authors should briefly comment on these questions in the Results and Discussion section of the paper in a paragraph that precedes the Conclusion section.

Acknowledgements: The authors should disclose any competing interests and where all funding and resources originated from. The authors should also give thanks to any non-author contributors.

All dose images are already included in our original manuscript (2014_IJBcRR_12680, Figure 2,A).

Results (line 167): As you suggested, we did re-write sentence (line 159-161) by adding p-value each finding.

Conclusion:

As you suggested, we are edited more effectively. (line 201-224)

Acknowledgements: We have included the section 5 of acknowledgements. As for competing interests, we have no competing interest exist.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Minor Revisions <u>Abstract Methods:</u> The authors should briefly describe the type of rodent model used in this study. <u>Abstract Conclusion:</u> Should two separate conclusions be listed? I believe these two thoughts should be consolidated into one conclusion section. <u>Introduction (line 35):</u> The phrase “metabolic syndromes” should be replaced with “metabolic disease” because metabolic syndrome has a meaningful clinical definition which describes a constellation of pathologies, not a single metabolic issue. <u>Introduction:</u> The structure of the introduction could benefit from a slight re-organization. Specifically, the sentence which spans line 50-52 should be placed before the sentence which reads “<i>However, the anti-obesity effects of unripe and ripe.....</i>” <u>Introduction (line 56):</u> The phrase “anti-obesity effects” should be replaced with the phrase “effects” because cells cannot be obese. This phrase should only be used when discussing hypotheses and results from animal studies. <u>Materials and Methods:</u> The authors should state that when using ethanol suspension that control cells received equivocal final concentrations of ethanol. <u>Results (line 161):</u> The first two words in this sentence are capitalized and should not be. This sentence should be re-written. <u>Acknowledgements:</u> The authors should disclose any competing interests and where all funding and resources originated from. The authors should also give thanks to any non-author contributors. The authors should declare if there are competing issues in the acknowledgement section of the text	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	None	