



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | 2013_BJMMR_8559 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Hepatic Antioxidant Effect of Paroxetine in Rats Exposed to Chronic Restraint Model |
| Type of the Article | Original 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>1-Better explain the environmental conditions of rodents and all details of packing and handling them. Explain why you used this number of animals and if it was the minimal required to a well done research.</p> <p>2-There are tables with means and standard deviations in the tables, however do not see the results of the used test. It would be interesting to present more complete tables of the overall result, not only the P found. What is the correlation of results, strong? Weak? Positive or negative? It is essential for better understanding and a deep discussion.</p> <p>3-Even doing a discussion encompassing discussion and conclusion, I think that after this hard work, a more detailed conclusion should be presented not only a simple and vague paragraph.</p> | <p>1-From the mean\pmSD determined by a pilot study that I did , I placed in the manuscript the justification of the sample size from a test on the microlab as follows:</p> <p>Justification of Sample size</p> <p>Number of rats in each group = 10 was determined by sample size determination using program of Microlab, version 2005 so as the α value is < 0.05 and β value is $> 80\%$. The 10 rats/group is the minimal number sufficient to produce these statistical values determined by the pilot study done before the full experimental research. Values will be statistically analysed using Prism version 3.0 to calculate analysis of variance [ANOVA] between different studied groups and to determine which group is responsible for the significant changes.</p> <p>Experimental protocol:</p> <p>Rats were weighed and each one was placed in an individual cage. They were assigned to experimental or control groups (n=10 in each group). The control animals were left undisturbed during the 21 days-period, except for scheduled daily ip injection of saline simulating the test group of treated animals, in addition to cleaning, feeding</p> |



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>and weighing procedures</p> <p>2- pearson correlation = 0.9 with perfect positive linear relationship</p> <p>3-I added as a conclusion: In conclusion, the results of the present study demonstrated a strong correlation between the positive results of paroxetine on hepatic transaminases, some hepatic anti-oxidant enzymes and its ability to replenish glutathione production in isolated hepatic cells of stressed rats. These results would assume a helpful anti-oxidant protective effect on hepatic tissues of chronic restrained rats. Meanwhile, the results of the present study would be a guide for a clinical trial on depressed patients suffering from hepatic impairment</p> |
|--|--|--|



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | 1- After using a term and submit the abbreviation, follow with this abbreviation throughout the text. | I uniformed the abbreviations throughout the manuscript as recommended |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | The authors declares that the study was conducted under the ethical rules of their country. I did not see issues at this aspect. | <p>Ethics was followed according to NIH rules of animal studies that are followed in my institute Paragraph: Ethics</p> <p>All procedures were in accordance with the National Institute of Health's Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals, as well as the guidelines of the Animal Welfare Act (www.nih.gov).</p> |