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Effect of green tea extracts on oxaliplatin-induced peripheral neuropathy in rats

Jung Soo Lee1, Woon Tae Kim1, Eun Kyoung Jeon2, Hye Sung Won2, Young Seok Cho3, Yoon Ho Ko2

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

   **Answer:** Scientifically speaking, this study does not have great acceptance as use of alternative medicine (therapy) is not well recognized. I have promoted it because I believe in the usefulness or adjunct utility of alternate medicine and there is always room for improvement. But the authors are not strong or specific in their articulation of the purpose of the study. Proclaiming that they were studying the curative effect of Green tea extract against Oxaliplatin induced neuropathy is difficult to accept.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

   **Answer:** The experimental approach of thermal hyperalgesia is not appropriate. One has to leave enough room (difference in duration between the control and test) in order to evaluate the significance. The authors mention that they have set the intensity to 50% at the beginning and the latency in the control is low. In that case they would have reduced the intensity to even lower level to understand whether there is significant difference between the control and the oxaliplatin treated group.

3. Are the data sound?

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Discretionary Revisions: The authors mention in the material and method section that the weight of the animal used for the study as 290-300 g where as in the result section the weight of the animals in the two different groups were: 338 and 352 g. As a whole, there is lack of experience in presenting the data and results, which can be corrected by paying proper attention to the manuscript.
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