



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_29537
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF RAW QUAIL EGG ON INTRAOCULAR PRESSURE AND BLOOD PRESSURE OF HYPERTENSIVE SUBJECTS
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. It is hardly recommended an English review of the manuscript.</p> <p>2. In the abstract, the methods used needs to be better elucidate.</p> <p>3. In the Introduction, the authors assumed that quail egg cures diseases (page 2, line 42). It is not totally true. A food just has beneficial effects to health in a context of adequate and healthy dietary profile. In the absence of food (which characterizes undernutrition), a quail egg could also perform miracles to health. Perhaps some components present in quail egg are responsible for its effects on blood pressure. I recommend revision of this topic to improve the understanding of the context.</p> <p>4. In the introduction (page 4, line 74), the authors cited the use of quail egg in Chinese medicine, which does not have as many scientific publications as needed to be considered part of current treatment for cardiovascular health issues now a days. The reference cited (#15) is not from a scientific website. I suggest revision of this topic.</p> <p>5. In the Methods section, it is not clear which are the inclusion criteria for this study.</p> <p>6. The absence of a placebo is a weakness of this study, because the individuals were fasting before taking the quail egg. So, the effects showed in the study could be attributed to the fast state and not only to quail egg. The absence of a carbohydrate source early in the morning changes the hormonal parameters that control metabolic state, and this could influence</p>	<p>2. The abstract was re-written and changes highlighted on page 1.</p> <p>3. Lines 21-25 on page 1, of the old manuscript (under introduction) were deleted. Lines 30-31 on page 2, of the old manuscript (under introduction) were deleted.</p> <p>4. Lines 74-79 (on page 4) of the old manuscript (under introduction) were deleted Lines 87-93 (on page 4-5), table was deleted. Lines 28-30, on page 2 of the corrected manuscript are additional information, therefore these were highlighted. Line 42 (on page 2) of the old manuscript (under introduction) was corrected and rephrased Line 42 (on page 2) – line 73 (on page 4) on old manuscript (under introduction) were reconstructed and highlighted on page 3 of the new manuscript.</p> <p>5. Methodology: the inclusion criteria have been well elucidated in the corrected manuscript. Methodology is re-written under subheadings of Subject and procedure. (See pages 4-6)</p> <p>6. Placebo has been included in the study. On day 1 of experiment, subjects drank 0.6ml/kg body weight of Eva water. Eva water is pure natural water produced by Nigeria Coca-Cola Company. (See page 6, lines 127-134 of corrected manuscript).</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	not just blood pressure, but other healthy parameters as well. This topic needed to be better elucidate in the manuscript and in the discussion section. 7. The discussion is scientific poor.	The results and the discussion have been better elucidated. 7. Lines 229-233 (on page 12 of old manuscript) under discussion, were deleted. There was a reconstruction on discussion on pages 10-11 of the corrected manuscript. Lines 239-245 (on pages 12-13 of old manuscript) under Conclusion were deleted. This is reconstructed on page 11 of the corrected manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>