



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJBcRR_5105
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Human Beta Defensin -2 and Oxidative Stress Parameters in Ovarian Cancer Patients
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Analysis of HBD-2 levels in patients with ovarian cancer and its association with markers of oxidative stress is generally attractive. Although the design of the study is straightforward and results are clearly understandable, this paper needs a correction. Whereas HBD-2 is presented as a promising marker in the pathogenesis of the OC, low sensitivity and specificity is disappointing. Authors should explain this or not to attribute such importance of the decreased level of this protein in cases. Additionally, English definitely needs a revision by native speaker or language expert.	There was a mistake in the calculations of sensitivity and specificity (serum HBD-2) and to be changed and corrected as described in the attached manuscript (Table 4).
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are errors in units in tables. First, add units to abstract, second, M/l is not a unit; use mol/l or just "M". Third, units are not consistent and thus confusing ("mol/l", "M", and "g/l" in one table). I would suggest to recalculate to either molar or mass concentration and to use identical prefixes, if possible. Some abbreviations are used prior their definition. Please correct. Fig. 2: What is the meaning of positive correlation between SOD and HBD-2 of stage II-only patients? Why there is no scatterplot showing the correlation of SOD and HBD in all patients, as shown in fig. 1?	First, units in abstract were added. Second, unit of total antioxidant capacity (mmol/L) was added (Table 1,2,3&4). Third, The discrepancy in the units in table (1,2,3&4) is due to present different parameters and has different activates and concentrations. It is impossible to use identical prefixes for all parameters. Correction the abbreviations were done. A positive correlation exists in stage II of ovarian cancer patients when as SOD decreases, HBD-2 also decreases and vice versa as in (Fig.4). The correlation between SOD and HBD-2 in all ovarian cancer patients was not significant as in (Fig.3).



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The sample size is relatively small. Depicting data shown in Table 1 in form of column chart could be much more illustrative, I would suggest avoid using the table. The presentation of data in tables 2 and 3 using P1,2 and 3 is not clear, isn't there any other way to present such complex data?	Yes, the sample size is relatively small, but this is what we collected samples in this period. We are construct the column chart (Fig.1) for more illustrative beside to the table (1). Using histopathology report, patients were divided into types and stages. P1, P2 and P3 were the probability between each two types or stages as illustrative below the table (2&3).
--	--	--