



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3460
Title of the Manuscript:	Teratogenic Histopathological Effects of Lixisenatide on the Cerebral Cortex of Developing Cheek Embryo
Type of the Article	Original article

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this

link: (<http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy>)



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have</p>	<p>1-Yes, the manuscript appears to be important for the scientific community, especially for researchers and practitioners involved in the fields of pharmacology, neurobiology, and developmental biology. It addresses the impact of a specific drug, lixisenatide, on the developing cerebral cortex of chick embryos, which has implications for understanding potential adverse effects on brain development. Since lixisenatide is used in the treatment of type 2 diabetes mellitus, understanding its effects on brain development is significant for ensuring the safety of its use, particularly during pregnancy or in cases where fetal exposure may occur. Additionally, the study methodology and findings contribute to the body of knowledge on the developmental neurotoxicity of pharmaceutical agents, which is of broad interest to the scientific community concerned with drug safety and developmental biology.</p> <p>2- yes suitable</p> <p>3 -Yes, the abstract of the article appears to be</p>	



<p>suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>comprehensive. It succinctly summarizes the background, objectives, methods, results, and conclusions of the study. The background provides context by mentioning the common use of chick embryos in drug research and the specific drug, lixisenatide, being studied. The objectives are clearly stated, focusing on investigating the drug's effects on the cerebral cortex of chick embryos. The methods section outlines the experimental design, including sample size determination, tissue preparation, and histological analysis techniques. Results are summarized, highlighting the adverse effects observed in the experimental groups and the dose-dependent nature of these effects. Finally, the conclusion summarizes the findings and emphasizes the importance of further research and careful consideration of lixisenatide administration. Overall, the abstract effectively conveys the key points of the study in a concise manner.</p> <p>4- Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate for conveying the research findings effectively. The manuscript is structured in a typical scientific format, with clearly delineated sections such as Background and Objectives, Materials and Methods, Results,</p>	
---	--	--



	<p>and Conclusion. Each section serves its purpose in providing essential information about the study.</p> <p>5- Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears to be scientifically sound. It follows a standard scientific structure, including clear subsections and a logical flow of information. The study methodology, such as the experimental design, sample size determination, and histological analysis techniques, seems appropriate for addressing the research objectives.</p> <p>6- No its insufficient needed to be more updated.</p>	
--	---	--



<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Abstract Clarity: Ensure that the abstract succinctly captures the key findings and significance of the study without being overly technical. Review for clarity and coherence to make it easily understandable to a broad audience.2. Methodology Clarification: Provide additional details or clarifications in the Materials and Methods section where necessary, particularly regarding specific procedures or equipment used in the experimental process. This ensures that other researchers can replicate the study accurately.3. Results Presentation: Ensure that the results section presents the findings in a clear and organized manner, with appropriate use of tables, figures, and statistical analyses to support the conclusions drawn from the data.4. Conclusion Justification: Justify the conclusions drawn from the study findings based on the observed results and their implications. Ensure that the conclusion accurately reflects the study's limitations and areas for further research. 5. Language and Grammar: Review the	
---------------------------------------	--	--



	<p>manuscript for language clarity, grammar, and coherence. Ensure that sentences are well-structured, and terminology is used accurately throughout the text.</p> <p>6. References and Citations: Double-check the accuracy and consistency of references and citations throughout the manuscript to ensure compliance with the chosen citation style (e.g., APA, MLA).</p>	
Optional comments	nothing	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sara Mostafa Kamal
Department, University & Country	Egyptian Chinese University, Egypt