

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_130571
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Psyllium and Methylcellulose in Lowering LDL Cholesterol in Type 2 Diabetes Patients
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.	This manuscript is highly significant for the scientific community, particularly in the management of type 2 diabetes. It provides valuable insights into the comparative effects of psyllium and methylcellulose in lowering LDL-C and improving lipid profiles and glycemic parameters. These findings contribute to evidence-based clinical guidelines for cardiovascular risk management in diabetes patients.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Comment: The current title is clear and descriptive; however, it can be refined to enhance clarity and appeal. Suggested Title: "Comparative Effects of Psyllium and Methylcellulose on LDL Cholesterol and Glycemic Control in Type 2 Diabetes Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis"	
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.	Comment: The abstract is fairly comprehensive, but several aspects require improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none">There should be a clearer emphasis on the systematic methods used, such as the number of studies included in the analysis.Informal terms such as "good for patients" should be replaced with more formal scientific language.The clinical implications should be explicitly mentioned in the conclusion of the abstract. Suggested Improvement: Clarify the methodology and implications by adding details on the number of studies and sample population.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Comment: Overall, the manuscript is scientifically sound; however, certain aspects need further clarification, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The statistical analysis should be explained in greater detail, particularly regarding effect size and statistical significance.The study limitations should be presented more explicitly, including potential heterogeneity across analyzed studies.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Comment: The references are generally sufficient and recent (2019-2024); however, older references such as Anderson et al. (2000) should ideally be replaced with more up-to-date studies. Additionally, consider incorporating more references from journals specializing in clinical nutrition. Suggested Improvement:	

Review Form 3

	Add recent references that cover the latest findings related to dietary fiber supplementation in type 2 diabetes.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>Comment: The language used is generally appropriate but requires minor revisions in grammar and consistency in scientific terminology. Some sentences are overly long and complex, which may reduce readability.</p> <p>Suggested Improvement: Use more concise and effective sentence structures to improve readability.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Comments for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Study Methods: Provide a more detailed explanation of the inclusion/exclusion criteria.Language and Writing Style: Revise to enhance formality and consistency in language.Data Analysis: Include more details on statistical analysis, particularly effect sizes and significance levels.Tables and Figures: Ensure that all tables provide unique information without redundancy with the text.Conclusion: Strengthen the statement on the clinical applicability of the study findings.	

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:	Jekson Martiar Siahaan
Department, University & Country	Institut Kesehatan Delihusada, Indonesia