

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_24382
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Study of the Ameliorative Effects of Skimmed Milk and Tuna Fish in the Dietary Management of Osteoporotic Female 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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	Comments and Criticisms in Red; Suggestions in Blue. Summary. This is a reasonably well prepared comparative rat experiment to test the effect of skim milk and Tuna fish powder supplements added to diets in Dexamethasone Osteoporosis Induced [DOPI] female Wistar lab-rats. However it misses the writing-up mark, due to lack of style and some simple fundamental omissions, to being acceptable in this format for reasons stated below. The writing is not always explicitly clear. Example See line 13-14 below. The discussion is verbose and without figures not easy to follow. Much of this cd be placed in legends below illustrative Bar-graph figures. Although 5 rats were taken to test the successful onset of OP, the experimental group omits a positive control within the group subjected to the inducing variable. An extra group shd have been included. Namely group 6 DOPI, fed the same basal diet as the initial healthy control rats on a basal diet. This would eliminate in comparison any unknown natural rebound effects in the DOPI animals. This comparison is missing, and consequently the deductions and conclusions of the experimental group are not –“ water-tight”. Can the reported experiment say for sure, that a	Thank you for the meticulous review. We have tried to effect the corrections where applicable. We could not provide another group 6 as was suggested due to the exigencies emanating therefrom in the course of the research. It was incorporated in the course of our initial research proposal and plan. We could not process ethical approval as our institution's research guideline does not stipulate that for experimental animals except for humans.

	normal diet on DOPI rats would not allow reversal back to a non-significant outcome, when compared to the initial healthy Controls? Was the 2mg dexamethasone dosing stopped during the period when the animals were fed the Dried Milk and Tuna Fish Supplements; this is not explicitly stated. Line 74-75 and Line 78. What kind of Tuna Fish was used? Line 74 says Canned tuna Fish. Canned fish is usually in brine and has other ingredients. Line 78 says fresh tuna fish including bone was cooked. How were the same fed powdered equivalents determined? Was it by volume or weight, or by percentage of per Kg of diet? [4.4% of amount per Kg diet for maintenance. Raised on 13.3% for net Protein per Kg during growth phase. Ref: Nutrient Requirements of Lab animals. Ntl Acad Si Wshngton DC) as used for each? Table 1 refers to Titus Fish powder. Was the fish powder used prepared as reported by the authors themselves, or does the preparation method referred to, report the Titus processing? Is Titus fish provision a commercially processed fish-powder? This needs clarification. The writing style can be tightened up. E.G. Lines 13-14 and 113-116. See below. Presentation: Tables 4-8: Figures for clarity, as Bar-graphs with T-bars to show $\pm$ SD's, are preferable and clearer compared to Tables with numerals. The word analysis, which cd be shortened, will be facilitated against a series of shaded figures showing bar-graphs. This will facilitate the discussion comments.	
--	--	--

	Ethical issues : Yes. There is no IRB reference number date and title provided. There is also no statement about conflicts of interests by the authors.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		