



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_8940
Title of the Manuscript:	Tissue Standards for Aging Research
Type of the Article	Method 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

	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	This is a relevant study about methodological questions related to proteomic analysis. However , some questions need to be clarify to become able the study to be published. The most questions is respect to statistical analysis Methods 1- The study was previously approved by some Animal Ethical Research Board? Please provide and detail this information 1-Considering that authors compared different tissues in mice with different age (young and old) the statistical comparison among data obtained will be useful. If the authors introduce some new statistical analysis, please describe what analysis was performed in Methods, section 2.4. 2- The authors comment in Discussion section that results described in the study are in concordance with previous studies described in the literature (such as Aldridge et al., 2008). What is the main difference between the study described in the present manuscript and the other studies published in the literature and cited by the authors?	1. We have added the following paragraph to the methods section. "Mice were housed in controlled temperature rooms with 12-h light/dark cycles with food and water provided ad libitum. All protocols were approved by the University of Iowa Animal Care and Use Committee (ACURF #0609196)." 1- We have included the P values from the unpaired, two tailed, students T test to demonstrate which methods perform the best in aging tissue. We have described this analysis in the Methods section and included the P values in Table 1. 2-We have included a more thorough description of the difference in the discussion section.
Minor REVISION comments	The manuscript need to be English edited mainly Discussion section Please add in Table 1 and 2 legend a brief description about "CV"	The discussion section has been edited and expanded. We have added "CoV, the coefficient of variation, is a measure of the relative magnitude of standard deviation. It is the standard deviation divided by the mean" in Table 1 and 2.
Optional/General comments	The authors did not inform about Ethical issues	We have added this in the methods section.