



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJBcRR_7590
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Apo B and TG/HDL ratio with HOMA IR model to predict insulin resistance in patients with metabolic syndrome
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments <u>Abstract</u> Line 14- Methodology: 110 Patients <u>Materials and Methods</u> Line 70 - Materials and Methods Line 73- 120 subjects Line 73- The age group (35 – 65) Line 74&75- Group I included healthy controls and Group II included subjects with metabolic syndrome	• Line 14 – Methodology: In text, they are 120 normal subjects and patients and not 110 patients • Line 70- Subjects and Methods • Line 73- Correct, (Not 110 as in abstract) but includes patients as well as normal volunteers • Line 73- I think selection especially among females should be above 50 years or those who already in menopause, because the risk is about to be equal in both males and females in that age group. Or it is better to restrict subjects and patients to males only with the above age group • Line 74&75- Group I included (No.?) healthy control subjects - Mention the No. of each gender. Group II consisted of (No.) patients with metabolic syndrome	The correct number of patients is included in the text. Apologies for such mistake. Line No. 15 Since it is conventional to write material and methods we have mentioned the same and included subjects in this section. The necessary correction is done. Refer to line no.73 Since occurrence of either metabolic syndrome or type 2 diabetes is not gender specific and not related to ovulatory pattern we have included male and female subjects in the same age group. -----do----- (Line No. 74,75)



SDI Review Form 1.6

Line 75&76- All the subjects were matched for age, gender and were excluded for chronic diseases of kidney and liver as well as for cancer and diabetes mellitus Line 79- (WC) Line 82- 85 Line 92	(Mention the No. of males and females) • Line 75&76- All subjects and patients should be Non-Smokers, Not alcoholics and of about equal nutritional states, Coffee consumption per day should be the same for each, in addition to be free of any chronic diseases especially liver, kidney, diabetes, cancer and/or thyroid disorders. • Line 79- Waist Circumference (Should be written before abbreviation) • Line 82-85- Techniques: Precautions in sample collection, storage and performing the analysis should be mentioned. • Line 92- The parameters mentioned in methods did not include Apo B measurement which is the corner stone of the study?????	Suggestions are well taken and corrections included in manuscript. please refer to line no. 79,80 Correction is done as per suggestion. (Line no. 84) Precaution of sample collection, storage and performing analysis are mentioned. (line no.87-90) The method used for Apo B measurement is included in manuscript. Refer to line no.96
--	--	--

<u>Discussion</u> Line 140 – Miller et al	• Line 140- where is that reference in the text (Its No.??? and location in Refs)	The reference number is incorporated. Refer to line no. 164
<u>Consent</u> Line 167- from the patients	• Line 167- Was obtained from the subjects (normal controls) and patients.	Due correction is done in the revised manuscript. Pl. Refer to line no190-191
<u>References</u>	• References should be unified in all Refs No. 28 – 30, 33 → Name of the Journal. (Year); Volume: Pages: -----	Reference no. 28-30 and 33 are unified.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments <u>Abstract</u> Result: Line 20-22: Re-written Conclusion: Line 27- patients with metabolic syndrome may be beneficial at an early stage <u>Introduction</u> Line 49- is associated with increased in TG levels <u>Discussion</u> Line 114- Morato et al Line 116- Knights et al Line 132- but However Line 136- can also be made the non fasting state	• Line 20 – 22: The regression model between HOMA IR and either TG/HDL-C ratio or Apo B level showed significant positive correlation ($r=0.29, p<0.02$ and $0.041, p<0.0009$ respectively) • Line 27- patients with metabolic syndrome may be predicted at an early stage (NOT beneficial) • Line 49- is associated with increased TG levels (NOT in) • Line 114- Marotta et al • Line 116- Knight et al • Line 132- but however (Not However) • Line 136- Can also be made during the non-fasting state	Corrections are done. The necessary correction is done. Pl. Refer to line no. 30 Correction done refer to line no. 49 All Correction done. Refer to line no.138,140, 157, 161 resp.
---	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I think this manuscript is a good one if we fix all the variables that affect the Apo B levels which are multiple.	