



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b><u><a href="#">British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</a></u></b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_BJMMR_19678</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A New Anionic Bovine Tendon as Scaffold for the Repair of Bone Defects: A Morphological, Histomorphometric and Immunohistochemical Study</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<p><b>Fig 1 – H&amp;E alone is difficult to evaluate and the TG appears to have significant fibrous tissue rather than bone. Trichrome or Pentachrome stain would be helpful.</b></p> <p><b>Fig 2 – The EG appears to have excess connective tissue by H&amp;E, but the quant suggests otherwise. This needs to be addressed.</b></p> <p><b>Fig 3 – Without a comparison (control) group, these are difficult to interpret. Without higher mag, it is almost impossible to evaluate the stains. For example, the day 7 OC and OPG look suspiciously like non-specific staining. OPG at 30 days is very poor histology.</b></p> <p><b>Fig 4 – All 30 day histology is very poort. There is no comparison group.</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anonymous</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Rome "Tor Vergata", Italy</b>