



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_39326
Title of the Manuscript:	The protecting effect of vitamin E against chromosomal damages induced by extremely low frequency electromagnetic field on bone marrow erythrocytes of male BALB/c mouse
New title:	Protecting effect of vitamin E against chromosomal damage induced by an extremely low-frequency electromagnetic field in murine bone marrow erythrocytes
Type of Article:	Original research papers

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>As mentioned before, this study on the potential protecting effect of vitamin E on DNA damage caused by an extremely low frequency electromagnetic field (ELEM) is well conducted, the rationale for the study is sound, and the experiments have properly been selected. Importantly, the study findings have both medical and societal relevance. Although the authors have taken care of this referee's comments in the revised version of their manuscript, there are still some aspects which must properly be dealt with before the paper is ready for publication.</p> <p>1) There are still many linguistic and syntactic errors. A few examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'In this research'; substitute by 'In this study' - 'damages'; substitute by 'damage'; the plural of this word does not exist - 'evidences'; substitute by 'evidence'; the plural of this word does not exist - '4 contiguous days'; substitute by '4 consecutive days' - 'was decreased significantly'; substitute by 'had substantially decreased' - 'vitamin E treated'; substitute by 'vitamin E-treated' - 'have proved'; substitute by 'have proven' - 'proved harmful effects'; substitute by 'proven harmful effects' - 'in the lack of vitamin E'; substitute by 'in the absence of vitamin E' <p>And so on. The authors are strongly recommended to have a native English speaker review the manuscript before resubmitting it.</p> <p>2) The 'Discussion' is still too long and can be written in a more concise manner. For instance, a large chunk of the first and second alinea can be either entirely deleted or written up in less words:</p> <p>'Production of micronucleus is an index of the chromosomal damages. This test is the most common genotoxic test that shows chromosomal damages, including the loss or breakage of chromosomes. Micronucleus formation is the result of chromosomal damages (17,18,19). These damages in form of chromosome loss or breaks will produce micronuclei during cell division.</p> <p>This test was first performed by Schmid at 1973 in the mice' bone marrow erythrocytes (20,21). This assay was proved to be sensitive and quickly performed technique to study chromosomal damages induced by electromagnetic field(22).</p> <p>Extremely low electromagnetic field can induce chromosomal abnormalities which could be detectable by micronucleus assay. Increase in the frequency of micronucleus in lymphocytes of the workers expused to it is an indication for its clastogeneic effect (23)'. The authors should take into account that their message is important but rather straightforward: <i>be careful with extremely low frequency electromagnetic radiation</i>. By using an excess of wording in the 'Discussion' they are diluting this message rather than supporting it.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for considering our manuscript</p> <p>These errors were edited</p> <p>It was edited</p>