



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_49605
Title of the Manuscript:	CEREBRAL CORTICAL DAMAGE IN ADULT WISTAR RATS FOLLOWING ALUMINIUM CHLORIDE ADMINISTRATION
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>)



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>Line This study investigated the histomorphological effect of aluminium chloride on the cerebral cortex. RECAST</p> <p>Lines 7-9 Aluminium chloride as one of the toxic metal have been known to be the major environmental pollutant across the world which has led to the discovery of diverse Neurodegeneration diseases (ND) associated with metallic intoxication. RECAST.</p> <p>Line 12 143g-189g; 110-240g; WRONGLY WRITTEN; THERE SHOULD BE SPACE BETWEEN FIGURE AND UNIT . 143g-189 g; 110-240 g</p> <p>Line 13 grouped into grouped into REPETITION</p> <p>Lines 14-18 Group A rats which was the control and was maintained on standard feed (grower mesh) and water for 21 days, group B rats were treated with 0.2g of aluminium chloride for 21days, group C rats were treated with 0.4g of aluminum chloride for 21days, group D rats were treated with 0.6g of aluminium chloride for 21days. The aluminium chloride solution was administered orally on daily basis. ALTERNATIVELY Group A rats which were the control, were maintained on standard feed (grower mesh) and water for 21 days. Rats in groups B, C and D were treated with 0.2 g, 0.4 g and 0.6 g of aluminium chloride respectively for 21days. The aluminium chloride solution was administered orally on daily basis. DID YOU REALLY ADMINISTER 0.2 g, 0.4 g, 0.6 g OR 0.2 g/kg, 0.4 g/kg, 0.6 g/kg</p> <p>WHAT ABOUT STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF WHAT IMPORTANCE IS THE "maintained on standard feed (grower mesh)"? WERE OTHER RATS IN GROUPS B, C, AND D NOT GIVEN THE FEED?</p> <p>Lines 30-31 MDA, SDH and SOD THESE ARE NON-STANDARD ABBREVIATIONS AND SHOULD HAVE BE WRITTEN IN FULL AT FIRST APPEARANCE IN THE MANUSCRIPT.</p> <p>Lines 36-37 Key word: Aluminium chloride, cerebral cortex, histomorphogy neurodenegeration, SOD, MDA.</p> <p>KEYWORD IS ONE WORD NOT TWO; [SOD, MDA] ONLY STANDARD ABBREVIATION SHOULD BE WRITTEN AS KEYWORDS histomorphogy? I GUESS SPELLING MISTAKE</p> <p>Line 45 OF WHAT USE IS THE (Gupta et al. 2005) INCLUDED IN THE MANUSCRIPT? IT IS ALREADY CAPTURED AS [5]</p> <p>Line 56 WHAT DOES PD MEAN? THE FIRST TIME YOU WRITE AN ABBREVIATION IT</p>	The paper has been thoroughly revised to effect all necessary corrections required



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>SHOULD BE WRITTEN IN FULL.</p> <p>YOU USED BOTH BRITISH AND AMERICAN SPELLING OF Aluminium/ Aluminum STICK WITH ONE TYPE</p> <p>Line 57 THERE IS INDISCRIMINATE USE OF UPPERCASE THROUGHOUT THE LENGTH OF THE MANUSCRIPT e.g. lines 57, 65, 89, 90, 97, 102, 103, 106 etc</p> <p>Line 67 OF WHAT USE IS Julka and Gill, IT IS ALREADY CAPTURED AS [16]</p> <p>Line 100 Aluminkium?</p> <p>Line 123 WRONG SPELLING premilinary</p> <p>Line 124 WRONG SPELLING lased</p> <p>Line 126 cross...ventilated</p> <p>Lines 133-135 REPETITION OF HOW THE ANIMALS WERE DIVIDED.</p> <p>Line 136 0.2mls/kg, 0.4mls/kg and 0.6mls/kg THERE ARE THREE MISTAKES HERE 1. ABBREVIATION FOR UNIT OF MEASUREMENT SHOULD NOT TAKE PLURAL FORM; 2. THERE SHOULD BE A SPACE BETWEEN FIGURE AND UNIT. 3. THE LITRE SHOULD BE WRITTEN IN UPPERCASE. 0.2 mL/kg, 0.4 mL/kg and 0.6 mL/kg.</p> <p>Line 136 0.2mls/kg, 0.4mls/kg and 0.6mls/kg HOW DID YOU ARRIVE AT THESE DOSES? PEOPLE WHO READ THE MANUSCRIPT MAY WANT TO KNOW</p> <p>Line 136 YOU INDICATED THAT YOU USED 0.2mls/kg, 0.4mls/kg and 0.6mls/kg WHEREAS IN lines 15-17 YOU WROTE 0.2 g, 0.4 g, 0.6 g.</p> <p>Line 145 Blood were collected from the heart for biochemical analysis of enzymes. UNDER MATERIALS AND METHODS- IT IS APPROPRIATE TO STATE THE ENZYMES AND THE SPECIFIC METHODS OF ANALYSES.</p> <p>Line 146 $AlCl_3$ WRONGLY WRITTEN</p> <p>LINE 149 student T-test Student's t-test</p> <p>Line 150 WHY DID YOU USE 2-ways ANOVA?</p> <p>Lines 151-153 If the p value is greater than 0.05 (P>0.05) this means that the effect is not significant, if the P value less than 0.05 (P<0.05) this means the effect was significant. RECAST</p> <p>TABLE 1 AND FIGURE 1 REPRESENT THE SAME RESULTS. THIS IS CUMBERSOME, MONOTONOUS AND UNNECESSARY. CHOOSE ONE METHOD OF PRESENTATION</p> <p>Lines 172 The graph showing the effect of aluminum chloride on the brain weight, general decrease in brain weight occur in all the group when compared with the control.</p> <p>Line 182 Effect Of Alumnum Chloride On The Activities Of Sod, Mda And Alp In The Brain. WHAT IS Alp? IT IS NOT IN THE TABLE, RATHER IT IS THE RESULTS OF SDH THAT ARE PRESENTED.</p> <p>IN TABLE 2 n = 5; but in lines 134-135 rats were weighed and randomly divided into four</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>groups comprising eight animals in each group. RECONCILE THIS.</p> <p>Line 182 Table 2: Effect Of Aluminium Chloride On The Activities Of Sod, Mda And Alp In The Brain THE RESULT IS PRESENTED FOR ACTIVITIES OF ENZYMES IN BRAIN BUT THERE IS NO MENTION OF THIS UNDER MATERIALS AND METHODS. DID YOU HOMOGENIZE THE TISSUE?, ETC</p> <p>THERE ARE TWO MAGNIFICATIONS FOR EACH TISSUE- X100 X400. IS THIS NECESSARY? WHY NOT JUST USE ONE OF THE TWO</p> <p>Lines 286-303 THIS IS A REPETITION OF WHAT HAS BEEN PRESENTED ABOVE. IT IS MONOTONOUS.</p> <p>Line 310 TBARS THE FIRST TIME YOU USE AN ABBREVIATION WRITE IT IN FULL</p> <p>LINES 324-325 OF WHAT USE IS (Dua and Gill 2001; Abubakar et al. 2004a; Nehru and Anand 2005; Jyoti et al. 2007); IT IS ALREADY CAPTURED AS [43,44,42,45]</p> <p>Line 344 This project studied the histomorphological effects of aluminium chloride on the cerebral cortex REALLY? CAN THE PROJECT STUDY ANYTHING? RECAST LINES 350-351 in some research it was report RECAST</p> <p>WHY ARE RESULTS BEEN REPORTED UNDER DISCUSSION, IT IS NOT NECESSARY. (60.42 ± 4.40), (51.4±9.05), (33.06) ETC.</p> <p>Line 394 The study concluded that exposure to aluminium chloride could RECAST</p> <p>THE MATERIALS AND METHODS SECTION NOT DETAILED ENOUGH; SOME VITAL COMPONENTS ARE ABSENT.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>THE INTRODUCTION SECTION IS UNNECESSARILY LONG; THERE ARE SOME REPEITIONS. IT IS IMPORTANT TO BRING OUT THOSE ASPECTS OF ALUMINIUM TOXICITY RELATED TO THE FOCUS OF THE STUDY.</p>	
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	