SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_IJBcRR_12237**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Evaluation of Serum Level of Neutrophil Elastase, Superoxide Dismutase and Nitric Oxide In COPD Patients: Correlation With Lung Function Test**
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)

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	Authors evaluated the levels of serum neutrophil elastase, nitric oxide and SOD in COPD patients. Therefore, they also investigate the correlation between markers of airflow obstruction (FEV1 % predicted) with the serum level of NE, NO and SOD in COPD patients.. Thus, this study appear to be interesting in the clinical area; and I suggest major revision to improve the work	I agreed with the reviewer . I have make this correction in my manuscript as per the suggestion of the reviewer.
Minor REVISION comments	Authors should review small errors of concordance and typing. - The introduction is somewhat confusing and focuses on aspects that are not addressed in the study. - The study aims were not well defined, are confused and have been underutilized in the article. The authors can improve their results, concluding and discussing their data more deeply. - No need that the authors describe the abbreviations in tables, it can be put in the legends. - As suggestions, the authors may relate to age, gender and disease severity to the factors evaluated (NE, NO, SOD) . Furthermore, correlations shown in the study were poorly discussed in the article.	I agreed with the reviewer. I have made this correction in my manuscript as per the suggestion of the reviewer**.**
Optional/General comments		