



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJBcRR_17638
Title of the Manuscript:	Ischaemia modified albumin and Malondialdehyde level in subjects suffering from hypothyroidism
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract lacks conclusions. Introduction lacks a clear presentation of the hypothesis. No mention of Ethical approval was stated. Considering the nature of the tests performed, it is important to be sure no oxidative stress inducer medication or antioxidant supplement were taken by the subjects prior sample collection. The final conclusion cannot be supported solely based on the results of this study and is merely speculative. Ethical issues: Yes. Although the source of subject enrolment and obtaining of informed consent were stated, no mention of Ethical Committee approval was mentioned. It is mandatory to state the full name of the Committee, as well as the number and date of the approval report.	Oxidative stress inducer medication or antioxidant supplementations were not considered in our study. We are planning for extending our study considering antioxidant medications. We are agreed with reviewer. We are very much thankful for guiding us
Minor REVISION comments	Line 26: correct word "radicle" per "radicals". Lines 81, 121: centrifugation should be presented in terms of g force instead of rpm. Lines 83-84, 93-94, 96, 112, 117, 124: provide details for ELISA tests, reagents, and lab instruments (name of company, city, country and catalogue code). It would be interesting to have a better quality control assessment of lab testings. Lines 103, 129: replace asterisks in formulas by proper math symbol.	Research article is checked thoroughly and corrected accordingly



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 113: scheme has no title, nor was referred within text. Lines 117, 120: do not initiate sentences with numbers. Line 118: remove molar unit from parenthesis. Lines 133-134: data presentation is redundant with table 1. Lines 137-139: data presentation is redundant with table 2. Line 174: table 1 formatting is inverted. Controlled variables should be presented in columns, whereas observed variable should be presented in rows. Same for table 2 in line 178. In both tables rules should be reformatted and include legend to comply with the guidelines. Discussion is very superficial.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		