



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_51132
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect Of Ellagic Acid On Paraoxanase -1 Activity And DNA Damage in Acute Exercise
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	<p>In the study the authors wanted to evaluate whether acute exercise in rat could affect paraxonase-1 enzyme activity and could induce DNA oxidation and damage. The role of protection of ellagic acid on oxidative damage caused by acute exercise was also evaluated.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The text was written in very poor English. There are multiple grammatical and spelling errors which makes several portions difficult to understand. It seems that the authors did not re-read the manuscript before submitting it; would consider having an English native speaker or translator review the manuscript. <p>Abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Describe the methods better. It is not clear how the groups of rats used are constituted. No abbreviations should appear in the abstract. Furthermore, the abbreviation must not remain in brackets. <p>Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The introduction appears too superficial. The authors should better explain the biochemical characteristics of PON-1 and alleagic acid and why they were chosen in this study. In this paragraph 8-OhdG, the MDA was not mentioned and the comet test was not introduced. The authors should explain the reason for this choice. Many bibliographic entries are missing. <p>Methods:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The authors reported bibliographical references concerning the increase of free radicals after acute exercise. In my opinion, first of all they should have evaluated the ROS levels before and after exercise, also studying the total antioxidant power and maybe going to evaluate enzymes like SOD, Catalase etc ...In fact, antioxidant defenses do not depend only by nutrition but also by genetic factors. 5. The number of animals per group is quite low. 6. The exercise protocol should be better explained <p>Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. In the results are reported data of PON-1, 8-OhdG and MDA in tab 1. Data from comet test? Are reported in tab 2? Explain better. 8. Describe what the data in tab 2 refers to. The measures taken in the comet test were not described well in the methods <p>Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. The Discussion section is too long. 	The manuscript has been thoroughly modified accordingly
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	