



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	2015_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	

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This manuscript entitled "H2O2-clearance kinetics of crude catalase preparations from prostate cancer cell lines treated with physiological and synthetic small organic ligands of PPAR- γ " was trying to determine the differences in H2O2-clearance of two prostate cancer cell lines PC-3 and LNCaP treated with PPAR- γ ligands PGJ2 and nafenopin (Naf) for 48 hours. Enzyme kinetics and Western blots were used to confirm differences in H2O2-clearance. They found that PGJ2 and Naf induced PPAR- γ greater in PC-3 than in LNCaP. Their data suggest that the marked catalase activity of PC-3 and LNCaP, the high expression of drug metabolizing CYP450 enzymes and the different PPAR- γ induction kinetics in prostate cancer cells observed in this study can be explored for the modulation of redox status of prostate cancer cells with PPAR- γ ligands. This has certain importance for cancer treatment. Overall, this is an interesting topic and the author performed sound study. In addition, they have answered all of the questions the reviewers had and made some improvement. However, there are some figures need to be improved. 1) Figure 1, the author should label lane 1-5 directly on the figure. What it is in each line; 2) Figure 2 image is really blurred; please use a high quality image.	Please Sir I think it is rather the Figure 1, which was blurred and Figure 2 to be labelled 1-8. I have done all the changes. I hope I have got everything right
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		