BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Ophthalmology
ESPS manuscript NO: 14239
Title: Anticataractogenic effect of hesperidin in galactose-induced cataractogenesis in Wistar rats
Reviewer's code: 00504345
Reviewer's country: Bulgaria
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2014-09-28 22:03
Date reviewed: 2014-12-13 03:37

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[Y] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

My coments are attached as file.

BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Ophthalmology
ESPS manuscript NO: 14239
Title: Anticataractogenic effect of hesperidin in galactose-induced cataractogenesis in Wistar rats
Reviewer's code: 00504522
Reviewer's country: Greece
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2014-09-28 22:03
Date reviewed: 2014-11-27 14:53

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[Y] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting paper investigating the anticataract properties of hesperidin against galactose-induced cataract in rats. The author is focused on the ability of hesperidin to attenuate the galactose-induced oxidative stress which is a major pathogenetic mechanism of galactose cataract. Therefore, the author determined a wide panel of oxidative stress biochemical markers and tested their modulation by hesperidin treatment. The paper merits interest from a pharmacological point of view since the doses used (25-75 mg/kg body weight) can't be achieved from a normal human diet. Major comments ? The manuscript contains too many references. The references of the 3rd paragraph of introduction, describing the biological properties of hesperdin, can be limited to 2-3 review articles. ? Materials and Methods, Experimental animals: The number of animals per groups should be given ? Materials and Methods, antioxidant assays: The authors should describe in more details the conditions (amount of homogenate per assay, incubation time) of the enzymatic assays instead of just giving the principle of the assay. ? Materials and Methods, Statistical analysis: The number of animals per group is small and non-parametric tests should be used for the comparison

between groups. ? Discussion, 3rd paragraph: The author noted that "Two of the animals failed to show cataract formation and we assume a robust physiological adaptation by these two animals in response to increased galactose administration". Do the biochemical indices of these two animals support this notion ? ? Discussion: How does the author explain the hypoglycemic properties of hesperidin. Does he believe that hesperidin exerts its actions through its hypoglycemic effect rather than its direct antioxidant properties ? ? Figure 1: It is not clear which bar represents the serum and eye lens TBARS values. Moreover, the units of the y-axis correspond to the tissue TBARS levels not the serum ones. ? Tables 1-4: The tables 1-4 could be combined to one Table.