

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_81960
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Inhibitors in Ascertaining the Type of Isoenzyme of Alkaline Phosphatase (ALP) and its Clinical Correlations
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://journalajrb.com/index.php/AJRB/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>In this submission, the authors intended to check the role of inhibitors in ascertaining the type of ALP isoenzyme. It was good to involved 250 patients in one year, but before the statistical investigation, the classification should be paid more attention to. Several significant problems:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Serum ALP activity, <math>373 \pm 274</math>. This was a significant fluctuation. The author should explain this and I recommend the authors to divide the patients into several groups according to ALP activity level before further investigation. Otherwise the following discussion was meaningless.</li> <li>2. The sexual distinction should be considered initially because the physiological parameters might be quite different.</li> <li>3. The authors should suppose the causal relationship between ALP activity and other parameters, then verify them.</li> <li>4. The author admitted that the conclusion was not specific to some extent. Anyway, the inhibition of the involved inhibitors were not specific for ALP. Their side effects were different. The parameters were affected by the inhibitors directly? Or affected by ALP?</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The language use should be improved.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I recommend a major revision. The author should conduct a classification of the data first. Then perform their investigation as written in this manuscript.	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yu-Shun Yang</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nanjing University, China</b>