



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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Compulsory: Methodology and statistical analysis: It should be more thoroughly described as it is usual on papers They need to make clear, despite the ethical approval, when they uphold the standard treatment for Glaucoma or hypertensive patients, no harm was made as a result It is not clear the actual dosage and time of the treatment. It is rather confusing. The manner the present results and tables is not proper at all. All of them should be remade in the usual and international accepted fashion. They include a clear synoptic view, p value, etc.	Methodology and the statistical analysis used have been thoroughly described. (Lines 99-126 on pages 5-7 of old manuscript) was re-cast and better described in lines 86-139, on pages 4-6 of the corrected manuscript. All experiments commenced at 9 AM every morning. The dosage for the placebo was 0.6 ml/kg body weight of Eva water, which was administered orally per subject on day 1 of the experiment, The dosage for the treatment was 0.6 ml/kg body weight of fresh raw quail eggs, which was



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Otherwise the conclusions are not reliable. Is it a cross-sectional study?. If so, it must be stated</p> <p>Comments: My main concern if this treatment and its effect are sustained over the time and if there are collateral effect which they have not measured (cholesterol, for instance), and ultimately if this treatment is affordable, edible and bearable. Finally if it could be recommended or potentially replace the more standard ones.</p> <p>Minor The authors should try to use a more scientific language than a colloquial one. There are few reference for this somehow “magical potion”. Please add which are deemed in order to support beyond doubt of its beneficial effects.</p>	<p>administered orally per subject, on day 2 of the experiment. (Page 6 of corrected manuscript). Tables were re-formatted and properly presented under results, in the corrected manuscript. (See pages 7-9). Previous Tables shown in old manuscript were deleted.</p> <p>It was a not a cross-sectional study. It was a purposive study. The cholesterol level of the subjects was not measured because it was a short-term treatment administered. This will be recommended in long term study. The quail egg is no doubt affordable, edible and bearable. It may not replace standard treatment for hypertension but could be added as an adjunct therapy for healthy living for ocular and systemic hypertensive patients.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		