



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_45066
Title of the Manuscript:	The Investigation on the Correlation between Obesity Indicator and Hepatitis B and C
Type of the 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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First line, in introduction you should explain why you concern to research hepatitis B and C. And, you should explain this problem globally and then you explain this problem in your country. 2. Your research not focused at all in one point of view. So, I am a little bit confused with your idea. You explain more ideas but it is not appropriate with your title. 3. You should explain what methods or tools they use. 4. In conclusion, you don't explain too much in the discussion section so that between the discussion section and the conclusion, it is not interesting to read like not related to each other. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Thanks to the professional advices from the review committee, we will add a description of our motivation for the study in the introduction. 2.For the discussion section we also delete the discussion that is not directly related to the research topic. And because few journals use the three obesity indicators: waist circumference, waist-height ratio, and BMI to view the impact on B and C hepatitis respectively, therefore, it is difficult to compare directly in the literature comparison, only to present more similar studies to compare with. 3. In the conclusion section, We also have revised.
Minor REVISION comments	The references that you use too much. I think you should use the most recent 20 references to support this journal.	According to the review opinions of other committee members, we need to do literature supplements. Therefore, some parts of the literature have changed, so it cannot be significantly reduced. Please kindly approve.
Optional/General comments		

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)	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>