

Oxidative stress in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: A cross sectional study.Chakraborty S et al. (shuvra.chakraborty@yahoo.com)**Mechanical review**

Comments (06-Apr-23)	Author's response (19-May-23)
Thank you so much for submitting your manuscript to the BSMMU Journal. However, you need to address the following points to meet the submission criteria.	
1. Bring the running head after the title.	1. Formatted accordingly.
2. Author list need to be arranged like name, affiliation, email (see the submission checklist)	2. Formatted the author's list with affiliation, email ID.
3. Add a separate heading for the corresponding author after the author/s list.	3. Given.
4. Remove the footnote from page 1.	4. Removed.
5. Need highlights (bullet point) in a separate page after the abstract.	5. Added the Highlights in separate page accordingly.
6. Please follow the order of Acknowledgement, Author contribution, Funding, conflict of interest, ethical approval, ORCID IDs (see the attached submission checklist)	6. Given the Acknowledgements, Authors contribution, Funding, Conflict of interest, ethical approval, ORCID as mentioned order.
7. Attach the populated EQUATOR checklist as appropriate and reflect it in the manuscript.	7. Given EQUATOR checklist.

Technical review

Reviewer's information (offline review)			
Date review assigned	18-Jul-23	Date review completed	27-Jul-23
Reviewer name	-	Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No
ORCID	-	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	No
Reviewer's comments (14-Aug-2023) [Please select "Yes" or "No"]	Score	Author's response (19-Jan-2024) [Please write a response if score is less than 6. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]	
1. Is the title appropriate?	No	Revised the title. Now looks like "Oxidative stress in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: A cross sectional study"	
2. Is the research question or study objective clearly defined in measurable terms?	No	Revised objective (lines 71 to 73)	
3. Is the abstract accurate, balanced and complete?	No	Revised abstract (lines 27 to 33)	
4. Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question or achieve objective?	No	As revised the objective so now become align with the methods of the study.	
5. Are the Methods described sufficiently to allow others to repeat it?	Yes	-	
6. Are the operational definitions and ascertainment of key variables given adequately?	Yes	-	
7. Are the outcomes clearly defined?	Yes	-	
8. Are statistics used appropriately and described fully?	No	Explained statistical analysis (lines 99 to 103)	
9. Do the Results address the research question or objective clearly?	No	Aligned with major findings and objective.	

10. Are the tables and figures clear and appropriate to address the objective or research question?	No	Revised the tables (page 11).
11. Does the Discussion cover the main points of the paper?	Yes	-
12. Are the strengths and limitations addressed?	No	Mentioned the limitation in conclusion.
13. Are the conclusions justified by the results	Yes	-
14. Are the references up-to-date, and appropriate?	Yes	-
15. Is the standard of written English acceptable for publication?	Yes	-
Descriptive comments to the authors (Divide it into MAJOR and MINOR points).		
MAJOR points:		
1. Title: Not expressing the study type.		1. Study type has been mentioned in the updated title (line no. 2).
2. Objective of the study: not addressed. So, study design, sampling, analysis, result, tables could not be assessed.		2. Objective of the study has been mentioned in introduction (line no. 71-73).
3. Sample size calculation, Sampling technique: Not mentioned.		3. Sample size and sampling technique have been mentioned in method (line no. 81, 88-89).
4. Statistical analysis, test of significance: Not properly clarified.		4. Statistical analysis and test of significance were clarified accordingly (line no. 99-103)
Reviewer's Recommendation	Reject	

Responsible Editor's comments (14-Aug-2023)		Author's response (19-Jan-2024)
Name	M Mostafa Zaman	[Please write a response if score is less than 6. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]
ORCID	0000-0002-1736-1342	
1. Although the Abstract, Methods, Results and Discussion are not presented with enough clarity, it has some meaningful data. Therefore, we suggest the authors revise it for submission as a Research Letter. Then it should have an 80-word abstract, 600-word main text, 6 references, and one table. We have formatted the table for the authors' review and further work.		1. Revised accordingly for submission as a Research Letter.
2. If the authors agree, the manuscript should be submitted to our online portal along with their response to the reviewer and the editor (the current file).		2. Agreed and submitted.
3. A little guidance on the data analysis is given in the footnote of the table. Authors are advised to mention these in their Methods section as well.		3. Revised and updated accordingly (line no. 99-103 and table 1).
Editor's Decision	Major revision	

Final decision of the Executive Editor (22-Jan-24)	<p>We have decided on your submission to Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujib Medical University Journal, "Oxidative stress in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: A cross-sectional study".</p> <p>We are not sending it to the review again because it was already reviewed offline.</p> <p>We decide to: ACCEPT as a Research Letter</p>
---	--