



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_33166
Title of the Manuscript:	MODULATORY ROLES OF CLOVE AND FERMENTED GINGER SUPPLEMENTS ON LIPID PROFILE AND THYROID FUNCTIONS IN HIGH FAT DIET INDUCED INSULIN RESISTANCE RABBITS
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	The manuscript is good, brings additional information to the literature, but presents the following important limitations: - There is no information on the approval of the research project in ethics committee. The authors merely state that they have followed the principles recommended by relevant institutions.. - The writing is very amateur and without any indication of zeal, quality and attendance to scientific standards of presentation of text and tables. There are many orthographic and semantic error. Only in the summary, I realized $p = 0.5$ instead of 0.05, it will be instead of serum, sacrifice aon instead of sacrificed. The introduction has different font type and size. Several words appear pasted throughout the text (Syzygiumaromaticum, for example). The presentation of the groups of animals is confusing both in the abstract and in the experimental design. Note that in experimental design the normal rabbits are placed in the diabetics group (lines 130 to 140). The determination of glucose and blood preparation for other analyzes appears twice in the methods. The authors report in the statistical analysis section how glucose is expressed, but do not report anything on the other variables. In addition, the statistical analysis section is not the appropriate place for this information. The results section starts without any text. A table appears soon, without any previous	Thank for revising our paper, we agreed on the pointed errors, correction and to in-depth as correlate the discussions aspect of this paper.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	explanation. - The discussion is very superficial. Limited to restate results and make few comparisons with previous findings. Information on the relationship between thyroid hormones and glucose metabolism is repeated in the introduction and discussion. The explanation of the study results in thyroid hormones is limited to this relationship. This is very little, seen in previous studies, but not in the present study. I missed much of an explanation of how the two treatments promoted improved lipid profile and thyroid function. Nor did I see anything about the practical implications and clinical perspectives of the study results.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- The conclusion of the abstract is confusing. Only clove is shown in the results. New elements appear in the conclusion. - The state of the art presented in the introduction regarding the relationship between thyroid hormones and insulin is very interesting. However, it is poorly stapled (long paragraph and with more than one information). - In Tables 1 and 2 it is impossible to know which group is statistically different from which other group. Just placing the asterisk does not properly inform the result of the statistical test. -	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		