



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_28005
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of Insulin Resistance in Polycystic Ovarian Syndrome
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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The subject of the article is interesting. The parameters studied are considerable and significant. In addition, some comments are to be submitted to the authors to clarify them further. * In terms of methodology: 1- Authors should further explain the random selection of cases and controls. 2- It must specify the statistical software and the statistical tests used. 3- The authors announced thresholds (fasting insulin > 20 IU, HOMA > 2.5 & G: I < 4.5) for which the risk is significant (higher risk of DM Type II). Normally a multivariate logistic regression analysis should be performed to determine the predictors. More authors will perform a due curve "ROC" [Receiver Operating Curve) for each parameter to determine the thresholds present. <u>So authors must explain how they determine the above-mentioned thresholds.</u> 4- I think it would be important to do a comparison of average BMI and IR markers between group I and II for	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the age group [20,30[years and in. Similarly for the age group [30,40[years. GENERAL CONCLUSION: THE THEME OF ARTICLE IS INTERESTING. I THINK THAT THE AUTHORS MUST TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE MENTIONED NOTES TO IMPROVE THE ARTICLE.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Fethi Ben Slama</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Nutrition, National Institute of Public Health, Tunisia</i>