

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_124038
Title of the Manuscript:	Non-alcoholic steatohepatitis and vitamin D any correlation?: Mini Review
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This mini-review on NASH and vitamin D correlation addresses a relevant topic in hepatology. However, significant issues compromise its scientific quality:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Systematic misalignment of citations with text content. 2. Animal studies cited without clear indication in the text. 3. Inconsistent reference formatting, not written in Vancouver style. 4. Lack of clear description of literature search methodology, compromising scientific quality of manuscript. <p>These issues severely undermine the manuscript's reliability.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title could be more precise: "Exploring the Correlation Between Non-alcoholic Steatohepatitis and Vitamin D: A Mini Review"</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract lacks specific findings and clear statements on evidence quality. Revise to include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key findings or conclusions. 2. Current state of evidence regarding NASH-vitamin D relationship. 3. Main areas requiring further research. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Manuscript structure is good, but needs clearer subheadings and a "Limitations and Future Directions" section.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript's scientific correctness is significantly compromised by three key issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Systematic misalignment of citations. 2. Lack of clear distinction between animal and human studies, potentially overstating clinical applicability. 3. Absence of a described literature search methodology, undermining scientific quality of the manuscript. <p>While the review acknowledges some limitations and conflicting evidence, these fundamental flaws severely undermine its scientific robustness. Extensive revisions are necessary to ensure accurate representation of current evidence and improve the manuscript's overall scientific value.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References are recent but often don't support associated claims. Animal studies are cited without clear indication in the text. Reference formatting needs correction to Vancouver style. A comprehensive review of all citations is crucial.</p>	

Review Form 3

<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. However, there are areas that could be improved: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Some sentences are long and complex. Breaking these into shorter, clearer sentences would improve readability.2. There are instances of informal language (e.g., use of contractions like "it's") that should be avoided in academic writing.3. Consistency in terminology and acronym usage should be improved throughout the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Include literature search methodology.2. Provide more critical analysis of key studies.3. Clearly distinguish between animal and human studies throughout the text.4. Correct all references to Vancouver style.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Md. Shahid Iqbal
Department, University & Country	India