



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_20795
Title of the Manuscript:	H₂O₂-clearance kinetics of crude catalase preparations from prostate cancer cell lines treated with physiological and synthetic small organic ligands of PPAR-γ.
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	Title: Correct to: Hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂)-clearance kinetics of crude catalase preparations from prostate cancer cell lines treated with physiological and synthetic small organic ligands Abstract: Delete "s" in Aims. Where possible, write these (and other) abbreviations in full at first mention: PC-3 LNCaP PPAR-γ K_m V_{max} Line 12: Delete "of" Line 13: Add "d" to use Line 20: Capitalize W in western blots Line 34: Drug metabolising enzyme P450 was not reported in the result, hence need not be in the conclusion as written. The conclusion does not follow. It appears more of a recommendation than result directed implication and/or suggestion, hence need to be re-written. Introduction: Line 76: Delete "of" Conclusion: Drug metabolising enzyme P450 was not reported in the result, hence could only be in the conclusion as a	1. I have completed all corrections and highlighted as underlined in yellow color 2. PC-3 and LNCaP are not abbreviations they are notations. 3. The expression of the drug-metabolizing enzymes is shown in Results as figure 3. 4. I have followed reviewer's suggest to re-write the conclusion. Changes are underlined colored in yellow



SDI Review Form 1.6

	suggested possible implication of the result. The conclusion does not follow. It appears more of recommendations than result directed implications and/or suggestion, hence need to be re-written.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		