SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Biology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJOB_34230**
Title of the Manuscript:	**MOTHER'S CAFFEINE INGESTION AFFECTS FECUNDITY AND OFFSPRING BIRTH WEIGHT IN MURINE MODELS**
Type of Article:	**Original Research Article**

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	**Authors' response to final evaluator's comments**
1. The manuscript does not seem to have been submitted to a professional English revision, as suggested. 2. "The physiologic effects and common use of caffeine during pregnancy call for examination of maternal caffeine consumption and risk of birth defects." This sentence is repeated in the same paragraph, as previously mentioned (Introduction section). 3. Page 2: "The lower dose of 10 mg/kg/day is roughly equivalent to taking about 2-3 normal cups of coffee/tea per day or 2-3 coffee tablets or chewing 2-3 bar of caffeine-containing chocolate or equivalent [8]. Thus, 10 mg/kg/day is equivalent to 2–3 cups of coffee/day in humans based on a metabolic body weight conversion." I still believe that repeating the idea twice does not "explain the rationale for dosage selection" 4. Page 7: "This simply suggests that caffeine affected fertility or fecundity and this relationship is dosage dependent" The authors did not specify in the Methods section how they controlled the sample for other possible factors that may affect the fecundity. Therefore, we cannot assume that caffeine was the direct responsible for the reduction in litter size.	**The manuscript has been reviewed; reviewer could have pointed to specific areas of *grammatical concern* is there were. Typically, proofreading is done before the final publication.** **The second one has been deleted to avoid repetition.** **We believe it does; meanwhile the second part s not a mere repletion, but the use of the former is to explain the basis for dosage The statement that follows this part continues to explain the rationale** **We, can… We do hope that the reviewer also appreciates our perspective- that the research is a control experiment with a reference group [A] against which the outcomes of other**

5. Page 7:"When taken from both perspectives, caffeine actually reduced birth weight sums in the treated groups and Group C had the least sum of birth weight. Group D might have higher sum and average weight per litter than C but the number of litter per mother was quite relatively low in Group D. Generally, these results are consistent with many previous findings about caffeine's potential to reduce birth weight" I still believe that decreasing sum of weights due to a lower number of offspring does not allow to conclude that caffeine reduced the offspring's weight.	**groups are measured. We do not attempt to 'assume' as suggested; we rather 'conclude' based on the outcome of the experiment.** **The outcome is, logically sufficient; note that expect we sum the weights of the offspring, we cannot compare adequately the weight per birth- and that's what we did.**