



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_15433
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Monosodium glutamate on liver functions and Haematological parameters in Rats
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	General comment: the study reports the Effects of Monosodium glutamate on liver functions and Haematological parameters in Rats. The aim is clear and the experimental design is sound; besides, experiments testing the health effects of chemical compounds/products in live animals are always necessary. Hence, the manuscript is well prepared and arranged following the journal authors instructions. But the acknowledgement, author's contributions and competing interest were not indicated in the manuscript. Also, try to see a recent published article of this journal to see the arrangement of references. Make sure all the references cited in the main body are reflected in the references section. For example, on lines 51, 148, 162, 163, 168, 169, 170 and 185 references cited in the text are not reflected in the references section. Likewise, on lines 197, 208, 272 all the references are not indicated in the main body of the manuscript. On line 250, the reference cited was Paliwal et al., 2009, but on line 155, the year of publish is 2011. The results are clearly exposed, well interpreted and the conclusions briefly state the major findings of the study.	The observations were quite impressive. The references cited in the text (Main body) have been reflected in the reference section while the journal's reference format was adhered to. The acknowledgement, competing interest of the authors and their contributions were properly highlighted. The footnotes in the tables and graphs were properly adjusted as recommended in the minor revision comments
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Lines 120, 121, 122, 123 should be written in a combined form immediately below the table as; Note: Values are mean $\pm$ standard error of mean (SEM) of five determinations. Values along a column are not significantly ($p \geq 0.05$) different. A: Fed commercial feed (Control Group), B: Fed 0.5% MSG supplemented diet, C:	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Fed 1% MSG supplemented diet, D: Fed 5% MSG supplemented diet. This should be done to tables 2. Lines 133, 134, 134 should be written in a combined form immediately below the figure as; Figure 1: Effect of Monosodium Glutamate on Alkaline Phosphatase (ALP) in Rats. Values are mean $\pm$ SEM (n=5). A: Fed commercial feed (Control Group), B: Fed 0.5% MSG supplemented diet, C: Fed 1% MSG supplemented diet, D: Fed 5% MSG supplemented diet. Also, if any statistical differences involved, indicate it. This should be applicable to figure 2 and 3.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		