



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJBcRR_7264
Title of the Manuscript:	Total Antioxidant Capacity: Correlation with other Antioxidants and Clinical Utility of Their Levels in Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1. It is quite disappointing that the authors do not have the relationship with the clinicians that did the spirometry studies on these patients. Without the spirometry data there are no correlations made to pulmonary function even within the COPD group (smokers vs. non-smokers). This makes it very difficult to make any useful conclusions to the clinical significance of this study. 2. Despite the authors' comments, the statistics and presentation in the tables is still confusing to this reviewer. Yes Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics, but there is no justification provided for the use of the K-S test and what is considered significant. It is not clear why this test is used at all. The data for the ANOVA presented in Table 4 is fine if another reviewer asked for it, and it is should be the same data that is used for the Bonferroni for Table 5. It is not clear why the Z-S test is even used or needed. It is also not clear in Table 5 why the data is presented as "Mean Difference". The Bonferroni compares means between groups. It is done as a "post-hoc test" for multiple comparisons to determine which comparisons between groups are significant, once you know that the overall data set is significant from the ANOVA. The way the data is presented in Table 5 does not show this. It makes this reviewer question what data was used for the Bonferroni. 3. It is still not evident that TAC can be used for <u>diagnosis</u> of COPD. Perhaps for the <u>management</u> of COPD but this was not tested. The results only suggest that TAC is different in COPD patients and <u>may</u> have some clinical usefulness. This is all that can be said. Please change the wording in the last sentence of the Abstract/conclusion section to: "CP and TAC showed statistically significant differences between controls and COPD patients and may have clinical utility in the management of COPD. However," Please also change Section 4 Conclusion in a similar way. Also add "A larger study with enough patients in each COPD GOLD group will be needed to specifically link the clinical utility of these antioxidant measurements."	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer