

SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org

SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_38024
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of homeopathic drug on metabolic abnormalities induced by HAART in mice
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

1	AL EVALUATO	R'S comm	ients on rev	vised paper ((if any)					Authors'	response to final evaluator's comments
١.	From figure 1, t	there is no	SD of weig	ht. Are there s	significa	ant differen	ces be	tween mea	ans of	1	. Figure 1 was replaced by table 1 with all
	weights of thes	e groups?									data
2.	From tables 1, 2, and 3, I thought they should not have been separated since they shared									2	. the data was actually incorrect and has
	the results from the control and the HAART groups. I combined them into a single table and I										been corrected
	got this table									3	Statistical analysis has been corrected
										4	 n the table was added sentence
	laboratory parameters	HAART	Control	6CH	n	12CH	n	30CH	n		explaining how the comparison was
					μ				P		made (HAART with groups treated with
	Total cholesterol	157.9± 22.37		101.9±15,40*		151.9±15,40*		151.9±15,40*	0.051 0.1207		Chelidonium)
	Triglyceride (mg/dL) Creatinine	256.1±53,88 9.96±16.3	164.6.4±45.10 7.85±11.8	205.9.1.9±68,5* 11.99±16.4		257.9±68,5 12.99±10.4		257.9±68,5 12.99±10.4	0.1207	5	. I made another attempt to separate
		11.44±3.12	6.63±3.06	3.5±6.4		11.4±3.4		11.4±3.4	0.1207	0	results and discussion.
	AST(U/L)	61.7±4.943	40±8.08	40.2±30*		44.8±30.82		37.36±6.337*	0.004	6	was added in the introduction
	ALT(U/L)	72.73±21.23	56.91±19.09	45.52±14*	0.0006	72.31±16.64	0.3807	43.47±19.41*	0.0002	-	. I would not have this explanation only
								rs except /	AST		the finding that they have different effects
3.	and ALT were t As you mention	the same in red in 2.6 s	ncluding the statistical an	eir p values. T alysis "p<0.0	hey are 5 was s	impossibl	e.				
3. 4.	and ALT were t As you mention 0.051 was insig From the tables	the same in ned in 2.6 s gnificant an s, you shou	ncluding the statistical an id should no uld explain v	eir p values. T halysis "p<0.09 ot have been ? which groups	hey are 5 was s *. were co	impossibl tatistically ompared. A	e. signific As a rea	ant", thus ader, I gue	p = ssed		
	and ALT were t As you mention 0.051 was insig From the tables you compared	the same in ned in 2.6 s gnificant an s, you shou between H	ncluding the statistical an od should no uld explain v IAART and I	eir p values. T aalysis "p<0.0 ot have been which groups HAART with d	hey are 5 was s *. were co <i>C. maju</i>	e impossibl tatistically ompared. <i>A</i> s. Or did y	e. signific As a rea ou actu	ant", thus ader, I gue ally comp	p = ssed		
4.	and ALT were t As you mention 0.051 was insig From the tables you compared between control	the same in ned in 2.6 s gnificant an s, you shou between H ol group an	ncluding the statistical an of should no uld explain v IAART and I d other grou	ir p values. T halysis "p<0.0 of have been which groups HAART with (ups? This sho	hey are 5 was s *. were co <i>C. maju</i> ould be	e impossibl tatistically ompared. <i>A</i> s. Or did y described	e. signific As a rea ou actu clearly.	ant", thus ader, I gue ially comp	p = ssed are		
	and ALT were t As you mention 0.051 was insig From the tables you compared between contro Although you h	the same in the d in 2.6 s gnificant an s, you shou between H ol group an ave separa	ncluding the statistical an id should no ild explain v IAART and I d other grou ated results	ir p values. T alysis "p<0.0 of have been which groups HAART with ups? This sho from discussi	hey are 5 was s *. were cc <i>C. maju</i> puld be ion, if yo	e impossibl statistically ompared. <i>A</i> s. Or did y described ou read the	e. signific As a rea ou actu clearly.	ant", thus ader, I gue ially comp	p = ssed are		
4. 5.	and ALT were t As you mention 0.051 was insig From the tables you compared between contro Although you h discussion in th	the same in ned in 2.6 s gnificant an s, you shou between H ol group an ave separa ne results a	ncluding the statistical an id should no uld explain v IAART and I d other grou ated results und some re	ir p values. T aalysis "p<0.0 ot have been which groups HAART with o ups? This sho from discussi sults in the di	hey are 5 was s *. Were co <i>C. maju</i> buld be ion, if yo scussic	e impossibl tatistically ompared. <i>A</i> s. Or did y described ou read the on.	e. signific As a rea ou actu clearly. em you	ant", thus ader, I gue ially comp would see	p = ssed are e some		
4. 5.	and ALT were t As you mention 0.051 was insig From the tables you compared between contro Although you h discussion in th About the clinic	the same in ned in 2.6 s gnificant an s, you shou between H ol group an ave separa ne results a cal parame	ncluding the statistical and ad should no uld explain v AART and l d other grou ated results and some re ters, you sh	eir p values. T halysis "p<0.0 ot have been which groups HAART with our ups? This sho from discussion sults in the di ould mention	hey are 5 was s *. were co <i>C. maju</i> buld be fon, if yo scussic the effe	e impossibl statistically ompared. A s. Or did y described ou read the on. ects of HAA	e. signific As a rea ou actu clearly em you ART on	ant", thus ader, I gue ially comp would see postural p	p = ssed are e some pattern,		
4. 5.	and ALT were t As you mention 0.051 was insig From the tables you compared between contro Although you h discussion in th About the clinic piloerection and	the same in ned in 2.6 s gnificant an s, you shou between H ol group an ave separa ne results a cal parame d stress ma	ncluding the statistical and ad should no uld explain v AART and I d other grou ated results and some re ters, you sh anipulation i	ir p values. T halysis "p<0.05 of have been which groups HAART with (ups? This sho from discussion sults in the di ould mention in the introduct	hey are 5 was s *. were co <i>C. maju</i> buld be ion, if yo scussic the effection. Th	e impossibl tatistically ompared. A s. Or did y described ou read the on. ects of HAA his is nece	e. signific As a rea ou actu clearly. em you ART on ssary fo	ant", thus ader, I gue ially comp would see postural p or readers	p = ssed are e some pattern, to		
4. 5.	and ALT were t As you mention 0.051 was insig From the tables you compared between contro Although you h discussion in th About the clinic piloerection and understand you	the same in ned in 2.6 s gnificant an s, you shou between H ol group an ave separa ne results a cal parame d stress ma ur results in	ncluding the statistical and ad should no uld explain v (AART and I d other grou ated results and some re ters, you sh anipulation i a line 140-14	ir p values. T halysis "p<0.05 of have been which groups HAART with (ups? This sho from discussion sults in the di ould mention in the introduct 43. Or you sho	hey are 5 was s *. were co <i>C. maju</i> buld be ion, if yo scussic the effection. Th	e impossibl tatistically ompared. A s. Or did y described ou read the on. ects of HAA his is nece	e. signific As a rea ou actu clearly. em you ART on ssary fo	ant", thus ader, I gue ially comp would see postural p or readers	p = ssed are e some pattern, to		
4. 5. 6.	and ALT were t As you mention 0.051 was insig From the tables you compared between contro Although you h discussion in th About the clinic piloerection and understand you evaluation the c	the same in hed in 2.6 s prificant an s, you shou between H ol group an ave separa he results a cal parame d stress ma ur results in clinical par	ncluding the statistical and ad should no uld explain v IAART and I d other grou ated results and some re ters, you sh anipulation i n line 140-14 ameters in s	ir p values. T halysis "p<0.0 of have been which groups HAART with o ups? This sho from discussi soults in the di ould mention in the introduc 43. Or you sho section 2.5.2.	hey are 5 was s *. were cc <i>C. maju</i> buld be fon, if yo scussic the effection. The ould de	e impossibl itatistically ompared. <i>A</i> s. Or did y described ou read the on. ects of HA/ his is nece scribe you	e. signific As a rea ou actu clearly. em you ART on ssary for r exper	ant", thus ader, I gue ially comp would see postural p or readers imental stu	p = ssed are e some pattern, to udy and		
4. 5. 6.	and ALT were t As you mention 0.051 was insig From the tables you compared between contro Although you h discussion in th About the clinic piloerection and understand you	the same in hed in 2.6 s prificant an s, you shou between H ol group an ave separa he results a cal parame d stress ma ur results in clinical par	ncluding the statistical and ad should no uld explain v IAART and I d other grou ated results and some re ters, you sh anipulation i n line 140-14 ameters in s	ir p values. T halysis "p<0.0 of have been which groups HAART with o ups? This sho from discussi soults in the di ould mention in the introduc 43. Or you sho section 2.5.2.	hey are 5 was s *. were cc <i>C. maju</i> buld be fon, if yo scussic the effection. The ould de	e impossibl itatistically ompared. <i>A</i> s. Or did y described ou read the on. ects of HA/ his is nece scribe you	e. signific As a rea ou actu clearly. em you ART on ssary for r exper	ant", thus ader, I gue ially comp would see postural p or readers imental stu	p = ssed are e some pattern, to udy and		