

# Review of: "Effect of Supplementation with *Moringa oleifera* on Antioxidant and Oxidative Stress Biomarkers of Infertile Women: A Pilot Open-Label Randomized Clinical Trial"

Mikel Vicente Eceiza<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad Pública de Navarra

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In my previous review, I said that the authors had presented an interesting clinical study about the supplementation with *M. oleifera* in infertile women, which, of course, I maintain. However, I still think that some modifications are necessary.

## GENERAL

- Maintain coherence with abbreviations. You only have to explain that ROS is for "Reactive Oxygen Species" the first time you mention it (see that you explain it the first time AND the second, a few lines below).
- Check for possible grammar mistakes. ROS is plural: it is not "ROS influences," but "ROS influence."

## INTRODUCTION

- The paragraph about OS ("Metabolic processes in humans...") has improved since the last version, but it continues to need rewriting and merging with the following paragraph.

## METHODOLOGY

I have to say that this section was the most problematic in the last version, but now it is the one that has improved the most. However, the justification required in some cases has not been provided, so I reiterate:

- What is a "normal hormonal profile" (which values)?
- Why did you choose the age range? A gap of 16 years (35-50) seems too big.
- Why did you require women without a history of those illnesses?
- Why did you choose those exclusion criteria?
- Why did you express the error as the standard deviation, and not the standard error?

Of course, I am not asking for a reanalysis of the data; just some additional sentences in the respective sections should be enough.

## REST OF THE PAPER

The authors addressed the issues of the Results and Discussion. I reiterate that I would include the "Recommendations" and "Limitations" paragraphs inside the Discussion, but it can also work well this way.

Despite these suggestions, in general terms, the improvement of this manuscript with respect to the last version has been really significant, so I have to thank and congratulate the authors.