

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_130490
Title of the Manuscript:	Novel therapeutic multiratio lipid profile indices with chronic inflammatory biomarker for predictive detection of early muscle loss in young obese adults
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study is a nice attempt evaluating lipids and lipid indices in young obese individuals. However, dyslipidemia in obesity is an established concept. The authors could have added evaluation of the relationship of lipid indices with muscle mass in their participants, if feasible. Introduction: 1. Reference numbers to be cited in correct sequence throughout the article. 2. Aim and objectives of the study to be clearly defined. 3. Introduction part could be concise clearly explaining the need of the study in a relevant manner.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title needs to be modified in line with the study. Title of the article: Novel therapeutic multiratio lipid profile indices with chronic inflammatory biomarker for predictive detection of early muscle loss in young obese adults	

Review Form 3

Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>Aim of the study mentioned in the introduction is different from that mentioned in the abstract.</p> <p>In the conclusion of abstract, Cortisol was mentioned, whereas it was not mentioned in the article. The authors need to verify and mention appropriately.</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Aim of the study mentioned in the introduction is different from that mentioned in the abstract.2. In the conclusion of abstract, Cortisol was mentioned, whereas it was not mentioned in the article. The authors need to verify and mention appropriately.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>Yes</p> <p>Material and methods:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Type of study to be mentioned.2. Period and duration of the study to be mentioned.3. The authors need to justify the reason for including only females and in the age group 18-30 years.4. Was the sample size calculated.5. Methodology described for lipid parameters could be simplified.6. The age group of the study participants was mentioned as 18 and 30 years under 'Study population' whereas under the 'Inclusion criteria', it was mentioned as 18 and 26 years. The authors should verify and mention uniformly.7. Similarly, the number of study participants was mentioned as 120 in the 'Abstract' section, under the 'Study population' and in the 'Results' section; whereas under the 'Study design', it was mentioned as 60 subjects. The authors should verify and mention uniformly.8. The components of the 'Material and methods' section could be presented in a sequential manner for a better presentation	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<p>The references need to be cited in the text in the correct sequence. Suitable references need to be provided in the introduction and discussion sections at appropriate places.</p>	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<p>-Results:</p> <p>1. The heading ‘Result and Conclusion’ could be modified as ‘Results’ since the authors have presented only the results in this section.</p> <p>2. The demographic characteristics, anthropometric data, qualitative and quantitative data measured in the study could be presented in the form of tables.</p> <p>3. Methodology of data presented in figure 2 and figure 3 and the purpose of including these parameters in the study to be given.</p> <p>4. The results presented in Figure numbers 7 and 11 are contradicting with each other. The authors need to present correct data.</p> <p>5. The legends given for figure numbers 8 & 9 are same, however the graphs presented are different.</p> <p>6. Explanation of the results obtained in the study to be given in addition to the tables and figures</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>1. It was mentioned in the discussion that elevated CRI-1 and CRI-2 are markers of systemic inflammation. The authors need to justify this along with a suitable reference.</p> <p>The authors could mention the strengths and limitations of the study.</p> <p>As given in the ‘Title’ of the study, the predictive detection of early muscle loss was not evaluated in the study. Title of the study should be clear and in accordance with the aim and objectives of the study.</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	V. S. Kiranmayi
Department, University & Country	Sri Venkateswara Institute of Medical Sciences, India