



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_35257
Title of the Manuscript:	Hepatic lipase influences plasma lipid profiles and lipoprotein ratios in Lagos University Teaching Hospital patients with Ischemic stroke
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>)



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	ABSTRACT The entire abstract must be re-written. It is too long. Re-structure it to reduce the background information as well as the undue repetition of figures in tables. In fact, your abstract is even getting longer than your introduction. Reduce the length. Unnecessarily long list of figures. Just present the information in the statement as the figures can be seen in the results. This is a virtual repetition of your results and must be avoided. MATERIALS AND METHODS It is always important in anthropometric measurements to specify the precision/threshold of your measurements. For instance, was weight measured to the nearest 1 kg, 0.1kg or 0.01 kg? What about height? Was it to the nearest mm, cm or m????? Please, provide this information. Blood pressure is NOT an anthropometric index. STATISITCAL ANALYSIS You need to re-write this section again. This time, arrange your activities properly. For instance, why did you not use SPSS for all the statistical analysis? If you used different statistical softwares, specify exactly what each software was used for and what specific statistical tool was used for the analysis in question in the given software. What statistical software did you use for the	Thanks. It has been done. Done. Thanks. Done. Thanks.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	ANOVA?? Why did you use both one-way and two-way ANOVA?? These must be properly explained as they cannot just be presented as you have done. RESULTS Where are the results? What do your tables say??? You need to let an experienced person look at the work and guide you properly. In presenting results, you do not just present tables as you have done. In each table you must specify the salient information it contains and make reference to the appropriate table. You first write a summarised information regarding the data in the given table and refer readers to the said table for details. You need to consult someone who is experienced in scientific writing and publication to help organize your work again for re-presentation. Table 1 Look, you are not presenting a review paper. You are presenting an original research work. Why are you now presenting a table whose data you never generated? You have already indicated the use of NCEP-ATPIII criteria for defining dyslipidemia. Why are you now giving all these additional sources and definitions for the components of dyslipidemia??? Please, delete this entire table with its references. Table 2 What kind of comparison are you talking about here? What statistic did you use in comparing the six groups of patients? Did you use chi-square, t-test, ANOVA or what?? As things stand, this table is confusing and does not convey the right message to the reader. Your statistics must be properly done. With this undirected statistics, your findings cannot be trusted.	Table 1 gives a detail cut-off for dyslipidemia. I think its ok. Thanks. The statistical tool used was well explained. P^1 = P values when comparing control subjects (row factor). P^2 = P values when comparing stroke subjects (row factor). , P^3 = P values when comparing control and stroke subjects (row factor). P^4 = P values when comparing control stroke subjects (column factor). A $P < 0.05$
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The table must be re-designed and presented properly in a more simplistic but informative manner using the specified correct statistical tools. Table 3 Your 95% CL, what is for??? Is it for both controls and patients or for patients alone or only controls? You seem to be mixing up things here. You have presented mean+/- SD values for both cases and controls. Your 95% CL, must be done separately for patients and controls. You cannot have a composite 95% CL for the two groups. You really need to redo the statistical aspect of the work if you want it published. Discussion I did not read the discussion since in my view it is based on wrongful application of statistics. But as a note of caution, do not discuss things you never made reference to in your work. Data you never shown must be indicated still in the results. If you fail to do that you cannot discuss it. Discuss what you showed.	s considered statistically significant. Student 't' test was used to compare the significance of the difference in the values between the control and ischemic stroke subjects using GraphPad software. The 95%CL is for both control and cases, it is well presented when using GraphPad software. Since you did not read the discussion, there is no need of making any comment.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This work seems to have been prepared by someone who has never had any experience in this area of scientific work. How the results have been presented and the related tables give that impression. The work must be re-analysed to enable appropriate discussion to be done. It must be rejected but given the chance to redo the analysis re-write the methods-conclusion part again hopefully under the guidance of an experienced researcher in his/her institution before re-submission for consideration. Ethical issues have been addressed	Since you did not read the work properly (you did not read the discussion at all), from your comments, it is clear that you are not conversant with GraphPad prism software that's why you are finding it difficult to understand the interpretation of the results.