



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_40699
Title of the Manuscript:	REPRODUCTIVE TOXICITY & BIOMARKER RESPONSE TO A DAILY DOSE OF TOOTHPASTE (CLOSE UP) IN MALE ALBINO RATS ( <i>Rattus norvegicus</i> )
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<div><div><div><div><div></div><div>1<sup>st</sup> week</div></div><div><div>Control</div><div>Test</div></div></div><div><div><div>2<sup>nd</sup> week</div><div>3<sup>rd</sup> week</div></div><div><div>Control</div><div>Test</div></div></div></div><div><div>Protein</div><div></div><div></div></div><div><div>Hb</div><div></div><div></div></div></div> <div><div><div>1. Author should give details of doses and criteria of choosing experimental dose.</div><div>2. Age of rats and how much intake of toothpaste by each rats is not clear, mention the same.</div><div>3. 3 no. rats from each group is less, so more errors are evident in mean and SE, need justification under methodology.</div><div>4. Author should mention the biochemical parameters for Heparin and EDTA two different anticoagulant added samples.</div><div>5. Author should change the Table format as follow for better presentation of result. Present Table is confusing for comparison between weeks.</div></div><div><div>6. Sperm counting seems to be erroneous by looking at SE, much variation is evident among the rats.</div><div>7. Even if I consider the data presented by the authors, only 1<sup>st</sup> week data shows variation, however later period has no effect. This is inconceivable, hence needs justification on this observation.</div><div>8. Author should rewrite the result as per data presented in the table, carefully explain the significant difference between the week or control/test, e.g. Not all the analyzed electrolytes are differed due to treatment or at all the weeks???, No significant difference in Hb in all the three weeks, platelets differe only in 3 and 4<sup>th</sup> week, etc.</div><div>9. Rewrite the discussion with response to findings observed and support the findings with citation.</div></div><div><div>Ethical issue:</div><div>Sacrifice of animals was not as per Ethical guideline.</div></div></div>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<div><div><div>1. Typographical and language errors are common, so need careful proofreading before typeset and galley proof.</div><div>2. First line of result should be deleted, as these parameters are not only restricted to these organ system but other has to be considered.</div></div></div>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<div><div><div>1. Title should be changed to ‘effect of daily dose of toothpaste (close up) on sperm count and blood biochemicals of male albino rats (Rattus norvegicus)’</div></div></div>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Vijay K. Bharti</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>