SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Applied Life Sciences International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JALSI_45289**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ANTI-ULCER MECHANISMS OF L-CYSTEINE IN MALE WISTAR 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)

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	**1. There are many typical errors in present manuscript. The authors should carefully revise the paper.** **2. The authors insisted that L-cysteine prevent the ulcer which induced by indomethacin. And L-cysteine showed increment activity of SOD and lipid peroxidation was decreased by L-cysteine. Furthermore, the production NO was enhanced by L-cysteine. It seems like the authors tried to link the NO production with gastric blood flow. Did the author measure the NO level in gastric tissue? Because only eNOS is related with vascular relaxation, I suggest the author check the NO level using vascular tissue.** **3. Experimental design: I recommend the below experimental design for more scientific research.** **A. No-treatment group (Negative control)** **B. Indomethacin-induced group (Positive control)** **C. 100 mg/kg L-cysteine** **D. 200 mg/kg L-cysteine** **E. 400 mg/kg L-cysteine** **F. 50 mg/kg cimetidine** **4. Figure 4. From Figure 1 to Figure 3, we could find dose-dependent tendency with L-cysteine. However, only Figure 4, the trend of the graph was not dose-dependent. Why did only this graph show non dose-dependent result?**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Tae-Gyu Lim***
Department, University & Country	***Korea Food Research Institute, Korea***