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The comparison of total capacity antioxidant in the serum of people with pterygium and control subjects

Reviewer: 1

1. It is not meaningful to compare the residence area of the control group with the case group in the study. Surveys such as occupational distribution of case and control group and outdoor activities (degree of UV exposure) may be more meaningful. 

It is difficult to say that the design of this study is well matched to the case and control group.

Response: The cases and control were according of outdoor (UV exposure ) living age , and sex matched.

2. Pterygium is a disorder of the ocular surface induced by chronic exposure to UV-light. And several studies reported that diminished antioxidant defense play a role in the occurrence of pterygium. So, I think this study is not new. It is important that the the sampling using Ferric Reducing Antioxidant Power in this study should be described in a manuscript with a certain characteristic compared to the method of evaluating antioxidant levels in previous studies, including thiobarbituric reactive substances (TBARS), nitric oxide (NO), total antioxidant status (TAS) and the activity of the three main antioxidant enzymes: glutathione peroxidase, superoxide dismutase and catalase.

Response: It was not possible to find a similar work to compare it but we try to do comparing our work by similar research and for that reason it needed another study designed to consider measuring more oxidative and anti-oxidative parameter

3. It is difficult for readers to accept the universality of the results of this study because the interpretation of the results is inadequate and abrupt. The research design needs to be modified to increase the number of subjects or to accept the antioxidant capacity using Ferric Reducing Antioxidant Power as a variable that shows the difference between case and control group.

Response: The antioxidant capacity using Ferric Reducing Antioxidant Power as a variable that shows the difference between case and control group. It needed to do another study designed to consider measuring more oxidative and anti-oxidative parameter

4. There is a lot of wrong grammar usage in English throughout the manuscript.

Response: The wrong grammar corrected throughout the manuscript.

5. It is difficult to understand the contents in Table 2. It needs to be easy to view.

Response: Table 2 revised to be easy to view

6. The composition of the manuscript is generally poor and inadequate. This is depressing the value of this paper.

Response: The manuscript is logically revised with hope of accepting reviewer.

Reviewer: 2

1. Please write the References after author’s guidelines.

Response: Corrected

2. Please correct the references in the text! Corrected

Response: Corrected

-ex.line 34/p.4 – Audontan et al? Corrected
-ex.line 9/p.5 – Choyee and colleagues ? from references no. 12,13,14 ? Corrected
-ex.line 20/p.5 – Pradhan and collegos ? nr.15 from references? Corrected
-ex.line 29/p.5 – Orhan H – nr.14 from references? Corrected
-ex.line 33/p.5 – Neelam (nr.16,17,18)? Corrected
3. The titles of the studies should be written with capital letter. Corrected
Ex: „antioxidants vitamins an eye (optic diseases)” – Antioxidants... Corrected
4. Please write „table” with capital letter : Table. Corrected
5. Please write all the keywords with capital letter! Corrected
6. Please correct the name of the hospital Vali-e Asr (peace without pterygium) ? Corrected
7. The text is full of mistakes! A lot of words are not correct written in English. Corrected
8. The references do not correspond with the numbers in the text! Corrected
1). Please describe in detail the bull’s keratopathy model along with its methodology and validation.
2). Please use these references in the introduction:
Alternatives to allograft corneal transplantation. Curr Opin Ophthalmol. 2010