

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_106204
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN PLEURAL FLUID CHOLESTEROL AND LIGHT'S CRITERIA IN DIFFERENTIATING EXUDATIVE AND TRANSUDATIVE PLEURAL EFFUSION
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, this manuscript is indeed important for the scientific community as it explores a novel method for distinguishing between transudative and exudative pleural effusions. The standard method for this distinction, Light's criteria, can sometimes misclassify certain cases, which can lead to improper treatment. The study in this manuscript suggests using pleural fluid cholesterol levels as an alternative diagnostic tool, which could potentially improve the accuracy of the diagnosis and therefore the effectiveness of the treatment. This research contributes to our understanding of pleural effusions and offers a promising alternative for its diagnosis, which could have significant clinical implications. 2. Yes, the title "A Comparative Study Between Pleural Fluid Cholesterol and Light's Criteria in Differentiating Exudative and Transudative Pleural Effusion" is suitable and appropriate for the content of the article. It effectively communicates the main elements of the study. This title accurately reflects the key topics, methodology, and purpose of the study. 3. Yes, the abstract of the article appears to be comprehensive. It provides a clear and succinct summary of the study, including the background and aim, materials and methods, results, and conclusions. Key details are mentioned such as the use of pleural fluid cholesterol for distinguishing between transudative and exudative pleural effusions, the number of patients involved in the study (140), and the significant findings (sensitivity and specificity of pleural fluid cholesterol levels in diagnosing exudative effusion). The abstract also mentions the potential of pleural cholesterol level as a biomarker to replace Light's criteria, thereby offering insights into the key conclusions of the study. 4. Yes, the structure and subsections of the manuscript seem to be appropriately organized for a scientific study. Here's a breakdown of the structure: Abstract: The abstract succinctly summarizes the background, aims, methods, results, and conclusions of the study, and also includes keywords for reference. Introduction: This section provides a background on pleural effusion, the need for distinguishing between transudates and exudates, and the limitations of existing criteria. This sets the context for the study and justifies the need for new diagnostic methods. Methodology: This section is further divided into multiple sub-sections (Collection of Fluids, Case Allocation, Principle, Procedure for Cholesterol Estimation, Statistical Analysis, Objectives of the Study, Inclusion Criteria, Exclusion Criteria) detailing the methods used, ensuring that the study could be replicated by other researchers if needed. Results and Discussion: This section begins to share the results of the study, although the document is truncated before we can see the full content. However, this section is expected to share the findings and interpret them in the context of the study's objectives and existing scientific knowledge. Overall, the document appears to follow the common structure of a scientific paper, which typically includes sections such as the introduction, methods, results, and discussion 5. The manuscript provided appears to be methodologically sound, with a logical progression in its introduction, methodology, and results. The study has a clear hypothesis, and the methods used to test this hypothesis, such as the use of cholesterol tests on pleural fluid and the application of statistical analysis, are commonly accepted techniques in medical research. The results are reported with statistical significance. 6. The references provided in the manuscript seem appropriate and sufficiently cover the topic. They include both classic and more recent studies, which is important to provide a broad perspective on the research subject. The most recent references are from 2021, which is recent enough for most fields, and the oldest (from 1972 and 1976) are seminal works that have been widely cited in this field of research. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communications. The text uses appropriate scientific language, terminology, and follows the structure common in scientific research papers, such as including an abstract, introduction,</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>methodology, and results sections. The text demonstrates a clear understanding of the topic and presents information in a coherent manner. However, there are a few areas that could be improved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The use of contractions such as "It's" should be avoided in scholarly writing. Instead, "It is" should be used. 2.Some sentences are complex and may benefit from being broken down into shorter, more digestible sentences. For example, the sentence "In 1971 Light et al. devised a criteria having high sensitivity and specificity of 99% and 98% respectively for differentiating transudative and exudative pleural effusion..." could be rephrased for clarity. 3.The use of passive voice is prevalent. While not incorrect, active voice is often preferred in scientific writing for clarity and conciseness. 4.Some punctuation is inconsistent, particularly around references, which should be checked for consistency. 5.There are some grammatical errors, such as "Various fluids samples were collected from OPD's and IPD's of Medical and Critical care units." should be "Various fluid samples were collected from OPDs and IPDs of the Medical and Critical Care units." 6.The document appears to be truncated, and the completion of the text could potentially reveal other issues. <p>In general, the document is well-written, but a thorough proofreading is recommended before publication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents a comprehensive comparative study on the diagnostic efficacy of pleural fluid cholesterol versus Light's criteria for distinguishing between exudative and transudative pleural effusion. The research is well-structured, providing a detailed methodology and clear inclusion and exclusion criteria. However, the results and discussion section appears incomplete, which is a significant gap. Also, the manuscript would benefit from a more thorough literature review, addressing the current state of knowledge and how this study adds to it. Additionally, it would be beneficial to discuss possible limitations of the study and future implications of the findings.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>leong Chon Man</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Conde de São Januário Hospital, China</p>