

Peer Review Report

Review Report on In situ oxidative stress in patients with epiretinal membrane

Original Research, Acta Biochim. Pol.

Reviewer: Beata Hukowska-Szematowicz

Submitted on: 10 Sep 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/abp.2024.13581

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The authors undertook to investigate whether there is a relationship between oxidative stress in the human epiretinal membrane (ERM) and morphological changes in the retina.

The main findings of the study are:

1. There was no correlation between the total oxidative status and the degree of morphological changes in the retina.
2. There was no significant correlation between the level of oxidative stress in the epiretinal membrane and morphological changes in the retina.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

1. The strength of the manuscript is the topic of the study - the effect of oxidative stress in situ in patients with epiretinal membrane.
2. Weaknesses of the manuscript:
 - (a) poorly described research methodology, poorly introduction and discussion.
 - (b) the main limitation of these studies is the use of only one in situ method to examine oxidative stress. I ask the Authors to explain whether it is possible to perform the study using another method, also in situ conditions? Such a comparison would be extremely interesting.At the same time, I am aware that in situ examination in this case is an advantage in itself and has great cognitive value in this case.

Q 3 Please comment on the methods, results and data interpretation. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

Methods -poorly described.
Results -described correctly.
Interpretation of data -good.
poorly introduction and discussion.

Check List

Q 4 Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List)

No answer given.

Q 5 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

Q 6 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 7 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

No.

Q 8 Are the statistical methods valid and correctly applied? (e.g. sample size, choice of test)

Yes.

Q 9 Are the methods sufficiently documented to allow replication studies?

No.

Q 10 Are the data underlying the study available in either the article, supplement, or deposited in a repository? (Sequence/expression data, protein/molecule characterizations, annotations, and taxonomy data are required to be deposited in public repositories prior to publication)

Not Applicable.

Q 11 Does the study adhere to ethical standards including ethics committee approval and consent procedure?

Yes.

Q 12 Have standard biosecurity and institutional safety procedures been adhered to?

Not Applicable.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 13 Originality



Q 14 Rigor



Q 15 Significance to the field



Q 16 Interest to general audience

Q 17 Quality of the writing

Q 18 Overall quality of the study