



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJBcRR_7264
Title of the Manuscript:	Can Total Antioxidant Capacity Be A Surrogate Marker In Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease ?
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors describe an interesting part of research which is often cited but only little investigated: oxidative stress in COPD. They analysed a batch of markers for oxidative stress or anti-oxidative capacity. However, some critical points need to be addressed: -title: it is not investigated if antioxidant capacity is a surrogate marker in COPD. So, the title should be revised. -same is true for the conclusion -what was the reason to exclude patients on LTOT? -in the method section, ferroxidase is suddenly introduced. The should mention why this is important in the introduction. -Results: the authors should described the study results in this section, not just referring to data. The data of table 4 can be embedded in Table 3. -the reason to present figure 3 and 4 are not clear in the result section. In the discussion, it appears that it is to test the accuracy of the used technique, which should be described in the method section. More than half of the discussion is focussing on the technique, which is not appropriate. Even, the authors are not sure about it, so the question is if the data	I fully agree with the reviewer Title and conclusion revised Patients on LTOT were found to have difficulty in spirometry analysis in our set up. I fully agree with the reviewer. Now mentioned in the introduction as advised I fully agree with the reviewer <u>BUT NOW REFERRING TO SDI PAPER TEMPLATE VERSION 1.6 DATE 11.10.2012, SECTION 3, (3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION)</u> are under same headings. Now table 3 and 4 have been completely modified I fully agree with the reviewer. Revision has been done accordingly. Fig 3 and 4 of old manuscript has been shifted to method section in revised manuscript



SDI Review Form 1.6

	can be interpret appropriately. -the authors state that TAC may give more relevant biological information. What information than? -some point is really not of relevant in regard to the manuscript. If the used technique is not optimal, the authors should first optimize that and described that in a methodological paper before including it in clinical relevant interpretation.	I fully agree with the reviewer. Revision has been done accordingly TAC was measured using globally available BioVision Total Antioxidant Capacity (TAC) Assay Kit from BioVision Research Products, USA. Only the incubation time has been altered and has been kept same and stringent for both the controls and COPD samples. Therefore data interpretation is appropriate
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-was there an ethical approval for the study? -the statistical section is to short. The tests should be explained in that section, not in the result section. Did the authors check the normal distribution of the data?	Yes, I fully agree with the reviewer. Revision of statistical section has been done accordingly. Please refer section 2.6 of revised manuscript
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		I am extremely grateful to this reviewer who has taken efforts to meticulously review this article. Thanks a million!