

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_84223
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Statin as a risk factor for cataract in cases of antioxidant gene polymorphism in Pakistani population</b>
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript “<b>Statin is associated with antioxidant gene polymorphism as the risk factor of cataracts in the Pakistani population.</b>” is now reviewed. The manuscript discussed the effects of statin-associated with antioxidant genes in the development of cataracts and investigated the risk factor of statin in the formation of cataracts in the Pakistani population.</p> <p>Overall the manuscript discussed about an important human ophthalmic disorder like cataract and various factors related with development of this disease condition, which will be interesting for the general readers. However, the manuscript in its present form is having few drawbacks and needs to revise on the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Introduction part is not clear, particularly as to how the use of statin is affecting the development of cataracts between statin users and non-users. The authors need to write clearly the importance of this study in the Introduction.</li><li>• The Materials and method section is grossly inadequate. The authors need to describe the high resolution melting curve (HRM) technique in details.</li><li>• There is also very less information on various SNPs identified in three genes (SOD1, CAT, GPX) and their frequency in the population were also not mentioned.</li><li>• Only few references were cited in this manuscript and a number of key references were missing:</li><li>• For example, <a href="https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2415-14-4">Rim, T.H.T., Kim, Mh., Kim, W.C. <i>et al.</i> Cataract subtype risk factors identified from the Korea National Health and Nutrition Examination survey 2008–2010. <i>BMC Ophthalmol</i> <b>14</b>, 4 (2014). <a href="https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2415-14-4">https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2415-14-4</a></a></li></ul>	<p>Importance of this study and effect of statin in development of cataract was added in the introduction part.</p> <p>Method of HRM technique was added</p> <p>Information of SNPs of three genes was mentioned</p> <p>References were added.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Overall the English language of the manuscript needs improvement to enhance the quality of the manuscript.</li><li>• The abbreviations used in the manuscript needs to be mentioned in its first use in the text.</li></ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	A revised manuscript may be accepted for publication in the <a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a> after incorporating the revisions suggested.	

### **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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	<p>All the suggestions were very good and I believe it has definitely improved the article. I welcomed all the suggested changes and the method of communicating was also very nice. I have made all the desired changes and resubmitting it. I am impressed with the review process and especially the approach of the reviewer which was not to reject the article but to improve it and make it more interesting for the audience.</p>