SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Medicine and Health**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJMAH_29693**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ACUTE EFFECT OF TOBACCO SNUFF CONSUMPTION ON PLASMA TOTAL PROTEIN, ALBUMIN, GLOBULIN AND FASTING BLOOD SUGAR LEVEL IN RATS**
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	In this study the authors investigated the effects of tobacco snuff consumption on total protein, albumin, globulin and and fasting blood sugar levels. For this purpose were involved in the study12 Wistar rats dived into 4 groups: one control group (A) that received normal feed and water while the remaining groups (B, C and D) received 0.72g, 1.44g, and 2.16g of tobacco snuff respectively as 0.6g, 1.2g, and 1.8g of tobacco-dust and 0.12g, 0.24g, and 0.36g of potash. Comments In the abstracts the authors said that B, C and D groups were treated with tobacco dust mixed with potash (tobacco snuff), while in the method section they showed the treatment composed by tobacco snuff, tobacco-dust and potash. The authors should better clarified the rats treatment. 1. In the abstract the results are not shown. 2. In introduction section, line 37, why the authors used "More so....."? I don't understand the meaning. 3. Why the authors have collected the blood samples with a cardiac puncture? Is there a reason for not having collected the blood in a different way? 4. In "Material and Methods" section the authors described for two time (in Animal Grouping and Substance Administration subtitles) rats	Based on this reply, 1). I will add the result in the abstract 2). Yes, we have taken note of the error in convening our idea. ''More so'' has been replaced with ''In addition''. 3). No, as a matter of fact, cardiac puncture was the convenient procedure as at the time of this study. 4). Well taken note of. 5). In using ANOVA, all these options can be used and the reviewer said if it were to be him/her. Well here in Nigeria, we like using LSD or Scheffe. 6). But other parameters showed statistically significant difference, so if it were to be the number of rats, it would have affected all of them. Well not with stand, the work is already done when we carry it out again.

	treatments and tobacco doses. They should correct this repetition. 5. When I want to compare multiple groups with a control groups, in the case of Gaussian distribution, are usually used the ANOVA with Dunnet post hoc test or ANOVA with Bonferroni post hoc test. May the authors explain why they did not use them? 6. In my opinion the number of rats in the groups are very limited. That could explain why the differences between control and treated are not different regarding fasting blood sugar levels. The authors would have to introduce other rats in the groups for a better statistical analysis. **7.** In the "Results" section the authors have not to report data in the text already described on the tables. **8. The description of the statistical difference on the tables are not clear. The legend "*N/B: all the values of the test groups with different subscript from the controls are significantly different at p<0.05"* and the superscript letters a, b, ab are not appropriate. Is better the use of *, **, *** to indicate the statistical differences.**	8). Well on the description of statistically significant difference with ***, **, *** etc, is always confusing, because it denote quantification, while the alphabet is more clearer**

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	The manuscript should be corrected by a native English speaker.	
Optional/General comments	The study does not provide important novelties on this topic.	**Thanks for the comment** **Authors comment**

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Valter Lubrano***
Department, University & Country	***Italy***