

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_99456
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Smoking on Serum Lipid Profile among University's Students in Dhamar City, Yemen
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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>INTRODUCTION The Introduction is slightly long. Three paragraphs start with the same word (smoking) and deal with the same subject, I suggest trying to merge it into two paragraphs.</p> <p>RESULTS Table 1 is very long and with data that could be better described. On age, for example, I suggest aggregating by 10 am 10 years. If you talk about the percentage of female gender, it is understood that the rest is male, so there is no need to insert it in the table. The same goes for the duration of the smoking habit, which can be illustrated with 1-3 years; 4-6 years; and over 6 years. The last item in Table 1 does not say clearly what it is about. What do the volunteers consume? Table 2 also needs to be revised. For all ages the result was non-significant? I suggest analyzing it separately by age group. There are an excessive number of tables, such as tables 3 and 6, whose data are similar and can be aggregated into just one. The results should be mentioned throughout the Discussion so that the reader can return to them and fully understand what is being discussed.</p> <p>CONCLUSION The Conclusion is vague. There should be more emphasis on the main results. What do the authors actually conclude?</p> <p>REFERENCES There are several references that are more than 10 years old! Are they really necessary?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fabiana do S. da Silva Dias de Andrade
Department, University & Country	Faculdades Integradas de Taquara, Brazil