

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_95675</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Disease activity score (DAS) correlation to serum prolidase as a collagen turnover marker in comparison to some pro-inflammatory markers in rheumatoid arthritis patients: clinical and sonographic study</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</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://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 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>	<b>My notes about the study.</b> <b>The title better to be changed to subject,materials and methods, Most abbreviation must be removed from abstract.DAS must be called DAS28 throughout the study.</b>  <b>Methods;</b> <b>the sample of the study is small,DAS must be called DAS-28 through out the study,I think there is enough suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods,the researcher used a lot of abbreviations in the study which need rewriting.</b>  <b>Discussion;the data is well controlled and robust and the Authors provide relevant and current references during discussion,but middle east studies comparism is important and better to be added.</b>  <b>Conclusions biased and based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Mohammed .H Alosami
Department, University & Country	College of Medicine, University of Baghdad, Iraq