

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_84574
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Oxidative Stress Involvement in Breast Cancer carcinogenesis
Type of the 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:

(<https://journalajrb.com/index.php/AJRB/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Authors analyzed and evaluated the involvement of oxidative stress on breast cancer carcinogenesis in Egyptian population. They found that oxidant markers MDA and NO were increased and antioxidant marker SOD was decreased in serum of BC patients. And oxidative stress was related to the progression and prognosis of breast cancer.</p> <p>The data showed here are valuable and meaningful. But,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. It would be helpful that authors could analyze the oxidant and antioxidant markers in serum of healthy volunteers, compared with BC patients. And, it would be more meaningful if authors could analyzed the oxidant and antioxidant markers in BC tissues compared with adjacent normal tissues.</li><li>2. All of the tables should be three-line tables.</li><li>3. There are many grammatical mistakes. Authors need to edit this manuscript extensively to improve the English.</li></ol>	<p>Many thanks for the valuable comments.</p> <p>1- we have already analyze all the tested variables against normal subject just a confirm that the patients recruited have the same figure as seen in different studies but the interest of the article is to compare the different prognostic characters of BC with the oxidative stress and antioxidant. Using patients tissue is a good idea will be our next interest.</p> <p>2- We did not understand this comment, would you please give an example to follow.</p> <p>3- Many thanks; anyway the English is not my native language, next time we will send to editorial English reviewer. We hope that the scientific target has reached with these grammatical mistakes.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>There are some grammatical and spelling mistakes</p> <p>Fig 1, please give the caption of Y axis for Her2/neu and ER ROC curve.</p>	<p>In Fig 1. The Y axis for Her2/neu and ER ROC curve were the sensitivity, we put it in between the two figures Her2/neu and metastasis</p> <p>And in between the two figures ER and PR. OK we will added to the figure.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>All of the tables should be three-line tables.</p> <p>The section of Materials and methods, please highlight the T,N,M stage of NCCN version, 7th or 8th?</p>	<p>We refer to reference 18 where all the classifications were well documented.</p>

Review Form 1.6

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	