

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_75972
Title of the Manuscript:	CORRELATION OF OSTEOPONTIN, OXIDATIVE STRESS AND TOTAL ANTIOXIDANT CAPACITY IN HYPOTHYROIDISM SUBJECTS
Type of the Article	Original research

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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Introduction-The theme is relevant, but the authors should better characterize its importance.</p> <p>The Materials and Methods section needs a major review to: either to include information needed and to review relevant conceptual question (I made the remarks in the text itself to facilitate the understanding.</p> <p>Results, the results presented are adequate and the analysis is adequate. I suggest the authors to review table 1. The results presented are consistent.</p> <p>Discussion is adequate, but I would like to read the authors explain how a new biochemical marker to diagnose these diseases could be relevant. Also, the strenghts and weaknesses of the study should be discussed.</p> <p>The references listed are adequate, there are not more recent articles regarding the theme and most of the literature published is about osteopontin and thyroid cancer, not hypothyroidism.</p> <p>(Please, check the comments made directly on the text- archive attached together with this comments form)</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	There are minor spelling and grammar errors to be corrected	
Optional/General comments	If the authors make the corrections the article is acceptable for publication, however, in the way it is written now it has some fundamental conceptual problems.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Monica Vinhas de Souza
Department, University & Country	Paraíba State University, Brazil