



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_13896
Title of the Manuscript:	<u>Association between follicle stimulating hormone receptor (FSHR) polymorphism and polycystic ovary syndrome among Egyptian women</u>
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	The article is well designed and carried out. It resolves the objectives proposed and leaves room to expand it further, according to the author's inclinations. I find it particularly interesting due to the association with testosterone and association with hyperandrogenism-related PCOS. It would have been more complete if it could have been done according to metabolic phenotype, however, this was not on the primary scope and therefore it doesn't reflect badly on this manuscript. However, there is the matter of certain degree of plagiarism (read below). The authors should change the highlighted sentences before publication, which seems to be especially from one particular reference number Fu et al and Max et al.	-We are very grateful for your comments and thoughtful suggestions. As you pointed, studying this polymorphism according to metabolic phenotype was not our primary scope. We would point out that such interest would be of a great benefit concerning our future works. -I apologize for the confusion. We have revised the highlighted sentences carefully and tried to avoid these blemishes. I believe that the modifications are now acceptable for the review process.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I suggest the authors to revise writing style in introduction, and first 2 paragraphs of discussion. The aim is to make the reading more fluent.	As you requested, We changed and rewrote the introduction, and first 2 paragraphs of discussion to become more clear and better than the previous. We hope you find this rise to your expectations.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I would like to suggest to the authors, to expand the study and analyze metabolic profiles against this polymorphism, given the fact that they found that these carriers had hyperandrogenism, and it has been suggested that according to metabo-phenotype of PCOS, cardiometabolic risk is different, and quite higher in type A and in Metabolically Obese NormalWeight subjects. (Guidance ref: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=23592224	We are very grateful for your thoughtful suggestions which would be of a great benefit concerning our future works. Thanks for your patience and the highly appreciated effort spent in following our manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	) I have found the following “copy-paste” situations that I have highlighted on the manuscript (highlighting the sentence, and using a commentary box to show the source of said copy). Please send the authors the .PDF file I am attaching.	-We received the attached pdf and the highlighted sentences had been revised and modified.
--	--	---