



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_43977
Title of the Manuscript:	BODY WEIGHT CHANGES AND SERUM GROWTH HORMONE COMPARATIVE ASSESMENT IN FEMALE LACTATING WISTAR RATS (<i>Rattus Norvegicus</i>) TREATED WITH METOCLOPRAMIDE AND SOME ATYPICAL ANTIPSYCHOTICS
Type of the 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		
Minor REVISION comments	1) Title: spelling error in the title,.....comparative.... should be corrected 2) Abstract: The aim and design section is not well written. eg The aim of the study... The design description should reflect the experimental nature e.g This is a case-control experimental study.....rather than the author's description of design of study which should be part of methodology. 3) Introduction should end with a paragraph on the aim and justification for the study 4) Line 50: The study was carried out....is better rendered The study was conducted..... 5) Result: The authors should report the ANOVA (F) value and exact <i>P</i> value while reporting the significance in prose. To say the $P < .05$ or $P > .05$ is vague and not precise. By giving us the exact p value, that inference can be made The result was too brief and not informative enough. The use of ANOVA alone was too simplistic. The use of other inferential statistics like t-test and correlation analysis would have deepened the analysis and yielded more useful outcome eg there would have been need to establish whether there was a correlation between growth hormone changes and weight gain changes. Also, why did the authors use more than one atypical antipsychotic medications in the study (olanzapine,risperidone) when there was no attempt to establish differential impact of these medications on both the growth hormone releases and weight gain changes. Analysis to include these dimensions would make the result more informative. In establishing weight gain changes, was the two weeks' time frame not too short? 6) Errors in spellings, typographical errors and incomplete sentence should be corrected eg line 106 (groups....group), 118,137, 127 (the action of the said drug....) should be rephrased 7) Conclusion: Line 146,147 seems to suggest that there was a correlation between the increase in growth hormone and the body weight changes. This should be rephrased to reflect the study finding.	Noted Thank you, noted Noted. The suggestion is good; however we set out to evaluate comparatively the effects of the drug agents used on serum growth hormone and body weight as our objective. After ANOVA we conducted a post hoc test to further ascertain exactly where the significance lies. A t-test is suitable for a design with two groups and does not allow the flexibility of multiple comparisons within or across the group as does ANOVA and post hoc. This manuscript is part of a research conducted to evaluate comparatively the effects of these atypical antipsychotics on Lactogenic activities of lactating female rats against the antiemetic drug (metoclopramide). As such the duration was shortened to two weeks because milk yield although not featured in this manuscript was assessed using pre and post suckling weight of the pups before they could begin to feed on other things beside milk. And the dams had to be sacrificed at the end of the period for biochemical analysis and histological evaluations. Thank you
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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	