



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Endocrinology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRE_48091
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF ACUTE AND CHRONIC TOXICITY OF TARTRAZINE (E102) ON STERIOD REPRODUCTIVE HORMONES OF ALBINO RATS
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	This study does not seem to have any significant out come and we have many such references in rats itself where much more detailed study has been carried out. Why this study has been designed in rates when we have sufficient amount of information available on tartrazine toxicity in rats? Acute toxicity of tartrazine probably will not have any reasonable effect on steroid hormones because hormone secretion has a complex pathway right from its steroidogenesis to negative feedback mechanism. Well chronic toxicity studies are welcome and it may really lead to some conclusive outcome. There are some doubts which need to be explained. The doses of tartrazine used in present study are too high when compared to other studies even higher than the LD 50. It is to be revisited why such high doses have been given and why there are no mortalities despite administering doses even higher than LD 50? The time interval given between intraperitoneal administration and sampling is not mentioned in the manuscript which needs to be recorded. The tables can be clubbed together for chronic and acute trials. The discussion has repetition of statements while justifying chronic and acute toxicity trials and needs to be curtailed. References are also too much that can be restricted to important and recent ones.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	There are some typical mistakes that have been highlighted and need to be corrected.	

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)  Nowhere in the manuscript it is mentioned that institutional ethical committee has permitted present study in rats. Since the study is invasive, toxicity risk involved, thus need ethical committee clearance.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Zahoor A Pampori</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences &amp; Technology of Kashmir, India</i></b>