



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_55632</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Electrochemically Activated Water Catholyte for the Activation of Hydrogen Ions and ATP for Sport's Shape and Recovery</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1.- The abstract must contain precise information about what the authors had been studied and the most relevant results obtained. Authors should present the information in a way that appeals the readers to read the entire manuscript. It should not have references and the authors should not be mentioned in first person. It must contain the purpose, the reason or the importance to study that and the results obtained. Please, rewrite.</p> <p>2.- In the introduction the authors have to explain in detail the object of study, problems, benefits and previous results obtained by different researchers in the field.</p> <p>3.- The introduction cannot start with previous results. The topic has to be developed. It is the part of the manuscript where the authors have to explain the reasons why it is very important to develop the investigation</p> <p>4.- The authors can incorporate the first paragraphs of the abstract into the introduction.</p> <p>5.- References were presented in two different ways: with a number or with the author's last name and a number. Authors must maintain a single criterion throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>6.- Could the authors explain the oxidative properties of hydrogen? Please incorporate examples.</p> <p>7.- Authors should avoid first-person references along the manuscript.</p> <p>8.- In the fourth paragraphs of introduction, after the reference (14) two stops appeared. Please, delete one of them.</p> <p>9.- The biophysical methods have to be explained in detail. The instrument used, the way in which the samples were prepared, the reagents used and the number of samples analysed.</p> <p>10.- The same recommendation (9) for the electrical measurements section.</p> <p>11.- The values obtained for oxidation reduction potential is the average of how many samples. It would be very interesting to incorporate a table with the results obtained from the different types of water analysed. The authors did not explain the way in which the samples of water were obtained.</p> <p>12.- What did the authors mean by hydrogen indicator? Which were the values obtained?</p> <p>13.- In section 3.2. a lot of information is missing. The authors did not explain the components of the electrolyzer used and its type. This information is very important because it is the source of catholyte and anolyte water. How are the samples of catholyte water obtained? Explain the procedure.</p> <p>14. In section 3.3. the authors must explain in detail in what way the catholyte was tested.</p> <p>15. The authors have to explain the experiment carried out with the hampsters. The characteristics of the population and how the authors analysed blood serum.</p> <p>16. Were the optimum values of catholyte and anolyte determined by authors? If so, how?</p> <p>If the information was taken from bibliography, please explain.</p> <p>17. The authors mentioned the words catholyte and anolyte along the manuscript but did not explain their chemical composition. They did not explain how they were administered.</p> <p>18. The authors have to study in more detail the function of the electrolyzer and the electrochemical equations involved.</p> <p>19. In the conclusion, it is not clear what connection there is between mountain spring and glacial water with catholyte and anolyte water.</p> <p>20. The authors do not appear to be familiar with electrolizers and the electrochemical process involved, or they did not present the information in the right way here.</p> <p>21. English language needs to be edited and corrected by a native speaker.</p> <p>22. A lot information is missing such as the method used, how they obtained the samples of catholyte and anolyte water, how they analysed the results.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The authors have a lot of work ahead of them, not only detailing the methodology used and the results obtained, but also improving the writing of the manuscript. If each of these tasks is carried out with the care it deserves, this work can be reviewed again and determine if the results obtained are consistent and publishable.	
---------------------------	---	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mar-A J. Lavorante</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Argentina</b>