

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_95672
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Evaluation of Plasma Lipid Profile and Electrolytes in Diabetic and Non-Diabetic Individuals Attending Healthcare Checkup in Everight Laboratory in Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria.
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:

(<https://www.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	2. 3. Title and abstract are fine. 4. chapter titles are not problematic, though. The description of the subject needs to be more careful. Since data on diabetes differs by stage of disease, the discussion also differs by stage of disease, so the consistency of the data is problematic. 5. Scientific validity is not a problem, but as mentioned above, it is meaningless unless the stages of diabetes are examined separately. This should be addressed by using health checkup data or by describing the subject a little more strictly. 6. The literature should be a little more up-to-date.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	This paper compares and discusses lipids and electrolytes in diabetic and non-diabetic patients. The results are expected, and the data and discussion are not new, but since diabetes is an important global health issue, it would be good to include the data for this region.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Takahiko Nagamine
Department, University & Country	Sunlight Brain Research Center, Tokyo Medical & Dental University, Japan