

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_101518
Title of the Manuscript:	Psychosocial Factors, Pro-inflammatory Markers & Serum Lipids among Patients with Suicidal Ideation & Suicidal Attempts
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:

(<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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Suggest changing to "comparison of psychosocial factors, pro-inflammatory markers and serum lipids between patients with suicidal ideation and suicidal attempts"</p> <p>Not quite satisfactory ... suggest adding the data analysis component to the method. Please add data/ result details from your findings to the result section (eg: descriptive findings & inferential findings). The conclusion does not reflect the findings of the study</p> <p>Subsections are quite satisfactory. Please add ethical approval by whom & ref. The results may need to be clearer tabulated following the format</p> <p>Quite ok</p> <p>Satisfactory</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is understandable. Suggest undergoing proofreading or at least using Grammarly for a better-quality reading. Please provide Grammarly / proofreader report</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This paper is appropriate to be accepted for publication. However, it needs further revision for a better scientific sound.</p> <p>Pls add further info & review on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract – add further info 2. Methods – sample size details, ethical approval 3. Results – display table appropriately 4. Limitation of the study 5. Recommendations 	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zarina Zahari
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia