



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_27076
Title of the Manuscript:	Lipoprotein (a) particles characterization by Dynamic Light Scattering
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	<p>This is an interesting paper that provides more information regarding the heterogeneity of Lp(a) particles and how this can be related to heart disease, thrombosis and inflammation. The major change that I would require for this paper is to separate the results from the Discussion. I would like the authors to very clearly present their results as Table 1, Figure 1 and Figure 2 so that the reader can see all the results together and then Discuss those results and interpret the meaning. Otherwise, it is very confusing and difficult to follow. This separation will enable the reader to understand what the authors are trying to present in terms of Particle size average, the peak intensities of the Lp(a) particles measured by the zeta sizer in the different K1V-2 repeats and the relative intensity peaks normalized versus small particles.</p> <p>It would also be very important to describe characteristics of the donors for the Lp(a) samples. Are they healthy? Do they have heart disease? How old are they? Male and female ratios?</p>	<p>The text was reorganised splitting the single Results and discussion section into two parts (Results and Discussion, respectively), as suggested by the Reviewer. The Discussion section was greatly revised and a new figure introduced to better clarify the shape of Lp(a).</p> <p>The available data regarding the source of plasma were supplied in the text. These include: institutional source of plasma samples, health status and age range of donors (derived from the regulations for donations active in Italy at the moment). Data regarding sex are, unfortunately, not available.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It would be appropriate to mention what are the weakness of this paper since the zeta sizer provided some data that are not easy to explain (Figure 1)	The main weakness of the work, derived from the new combination of techniques adopted, was underlined at the end of the Conclusions section.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is well written but because the topic is difficult to follow, doing a separation of results and discussion might help in understanding what the aims are for this paper.	This suggestion was followed throughout the text.