



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_50494
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF OXIDATIVE STRESS MARKERS AND HORMONAL PROFILES IN WOMEN DIAGNOSED WITH INFERTILITY IN PORT HARCOURT
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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Ms AJBGMB 50494 can be accepted with some minor revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the methodology used by the authors, CUPRAC assay is certainly a valid analytical method, but not from a complete view of the functionality of the anti-oxidant state that is affected by oxidative stress. The assay of SOD, GPx, GSH enzymes would give completeness to the presented investigation. the lipid peroxidation index obtained as the ratio of MDA: TAC could return non-real values, the authors could consider the dosage of isoprostanes as a quantifiable indication of the LPI data. - In the evaluation of stressors the authors excluded smoking patients, it is known that smoking induces oxidative stress to an equal or greater extent than alcohol consumption - The correction of some typing errors is necessary. - the bibliography must be integrated with more recent publications. 	<p>It will be an almost impossible task to measure one by one all the antioxidants present in a living organism. Hence the more convenient way of accessing the antioxidant status of an individual is to determine the total antioxidant capacity (TAC). TAC gives an estimate of the overall activities of non-enzymatic antioxidants taking place in an organism [18]. This position influenced the authors choice of TAC as a measure of antioxidants in the study. However the suggestion by the reviewer is highly welcome and shall be considered in further studies requiring measurement of antioxidants.</p> <p>The suggestion to consider the dosage of isoprostanes as a quantifiable indication of LPI is well taken. However, its implementation in the present study may not be possible. The calculation of LPI based on MDA: TAC was based on the published work of reference [19] in the manuscript and we believe that after due dilligence to experimental protocols, the data obtained reflects the lipid peroxidation status of the subjects studied.</p> <p>We agree that smoking induces oxidative stress to an extent greater than or equal to alcohol consumption. That was why all smokers, alcohol consumers as well as all subjects having urogenital infections were excluded from controls. However, case subjects with any of the stressors were considered. Subjects were recruited using random and convenient sampling techniques and our study population found not many of smoking women.</p> <p>The typing errors have been corrected.</p>
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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