

Review of: "Effect of Supplementation with *Moringa Oleifera* on Antioxidant and Oxidative Stress Biomarkers of Infertile Women: A Pilot Open-Label Case-Control Randomized Clinical Study"

Mikel Vicente Eceiza¹

¹ Universidad Pública de Navarra

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors have presented an interesting clinical study about the supplementation with *M. oleifera* in infertile women. Although, in general terms, it has been well conducted, I am afraid it needs some important improvements before being published. There is a high number of proposed changes, listed below.

GENERAL (not belonging to a specific section, should be corrected throughout the text):

- The scientific name of a species should always be written in italics, and only the first letter of the genus should be in capital letters: the correct way is *Moringa oleifera*, neither *moringa oleifera* nor *Moringa Oleifera*.
- Consistency should be maintained: an abbreviation should be explained only the first time it appears; reference format should be the same in all sections.
- Do not focus so much on the limitations of the study; it can appear to the reader that it does not deserve reading!

ABSTRACT

- The sentence "Thirty (30) fertile..." does not make sense; please rewrite.

INTRODUCTION

- The paragraph about OS ("Metabolic processes in human...") is quite vague and needs rewriting: specifically, oxygen metabolism is what causes OS, and it is quite informal to write that antioxidants are "superheroes". The following paragraph ("excessive generation...") is superfluous.
- After the citation of Agarwal (2005), there is a grammar mistake: ROS affect, not "affects."
- Which minerals act as antioxidants in humans? I wonder, but if there are, put examples.

METHODOLOGY

This is the section I have found most problematic. I suppose this can be a problem, but I really miss a ROS measurement. If it is possible for you, I would measure H₂O₂ fluorometrically.

Apart from that, justification is needed in some cases:

- 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?
- Just before Total Glutathione, the sentence “the change in absorbance is therefore” seems incomplete.
- Why did you express the error as the standard deviation, and not the standard error?

RESULTS

This section should be called “Results **and discussion**” and include the Recommendations and Limitations paragraphs, leaving the conclusion as the last section prior to References.

To me, the sample size of the study seems okay; it should not explain by itself the lack of significance of the results.