

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_96482</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Relationship between Uric acid, creatinine, Urea and Triglyceride production in Gout</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original</b>

### **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:

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>It is moderately important for scientific community.</b></p> <p>2. <b>The title is not suitable. I change it as below,</b> <i>An observation study on the relationship between biochemical parameters and demographic characteristics in patients with hyperuricemia.</i></p> <p>3. <b>It is not comprehensive, and needs modification.</b></p> <p>4. <b>It is not so appropriate, so I suggest to add some.</b></p> <p>5. <b>It is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p>6. <b>Yes.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>Language quality is acceptable for readers, but the punctuation is not.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The submitted manuscript aimed to study the prevalence of goat and uric acid, creatinine, urea, and triglyceride production in patients with hyperuricemia. Based on the statistic results, the author(s) declared to provide support for possible linkage of influencing creatinine and triglyceride and uric acid and triglyceride with goat.</p> <p>The manuscript was not well written, and the study design was easy to confuse. The results did not reach the study of prevalence from the motivation. However, as the requests of the author and the editor-in-chief, I do my best to finish the reviewing task in one day.</p> <p>Many grammar errors took place throughout the entire manuscript, including punctuation. Please edit those at your best. I also make some modification in the current version.</p> <p>The sentences of RESULTS in ABSTRACT showed repeatability too much. Please reduce the redundant. I suggest shortening by using combination of the four parameters, rather than describing one by one.</p> <p>With respect to "prevalence", the manuscript did not show the associated results, so please not use the word in text, except in INTRODUCTION.</p> <p>What is MSUM in INTRODUCTION? Please write out the full name when mention in the first time.</p> <p>The content of INTRODUCTION was too long to make me cut off some words, tag in current version in red and deletion line. It will be better to have 2-3 paragraphs. There is also lack of the Purpose (or motivation) in the last in INTRODUCTION. Please provide it.</p> <p>Please give a new page for INTRODUCTION, not following exactly the abstract.</p> <p>There was lack of the description of inclusion criteria and exclusion criteria in METHOD. I wonder what the lowest value of hyperuricemia for recruitment was, and if some ones were excluded because of renal impairment, and so on. Please replenish the associated sentences in METHOD as possible.</p> <p>There were too many Tables to read. I suggest combining gender together in one table, for instance, Table 2 + 3, Table 4 + 5, Table 6 + 7, and Table 8 + 9. At last, only five tables will be seen.</p> <p>Please place the Tables and Figures in the last pages, and illustrate those in separate page.</p> <p>There is lack of the CONCLUSION behind DISCUSSION. Please replenish it.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shin-Tsu Chang</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kaohsiung Veterans General Hospital, Taiwan</b>