



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#"><u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u></a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMPS_29537</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EFFECT OF RAW QUAIL EGG ON INTRAOCULAR PRESSURE AND BLOOD PRESSURE OF HYPERTENSIVE SUBJECTS</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Compulsory:</b> 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. Otherwise the conclusions are not reliable. Is it a cross-sectional study?. If so, it must be stated</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> 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><b>Minor</b> 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>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b><i>Patricia Siques</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Universidad Arturo Prat, Chile</i></b>