



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	1. There was not consistent in the number of subjects enrolled to the study – 110 vs. 120. 2. Need to be more descriptive and details on inclusion criteria for control group and metabolic syndrome group. 3. The study is case control study, not a prospective. 4. There was not consistent in the correlation coefficient, e.g., $r=0.29$ or 0.029; $r=0.41$ or 0.041. 5. Need more descriptive and details on the regression model, coverable non-adjust vs. Adjust 6. Need a table to show the results from the regression model.	The number of subjects enrolled for the study are corrected. Apologies for that. Pl refer to line no.73 Rectified in the revised manuscript. Inclusion criteria for controls and Metabolic syndrome is mentioned explicitly. Refer to line no.75-81 The study is prospective as all subjects were purposively enrolled during the course of the study. It is not case control study in classical sense as the patients and control subjects were not enrolled on case to case basis. The correlation coefficients are corrected. Refer to line no.120-121 The necessary corrections are done. Refer to Line No.118-124 A table showing the results from the regression model is introduced. Refer to Table no. 2p
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 60 [17, 18] not 17, 18]. Mistakes in line 66 and 67?	The references and mistakes are corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is not well written. It needs to be more descriptive and have more details about the study	