

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_84927
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of serum level of Interleukin 33 in Systemic Lupus Erythematosus patients
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The details of how to recruit subject should be explicitly elaborated. Is that a random or non-random sampling? The rationale of selecting 60 subjects and 20 controls should preferably be stated in the text. The background demographics (sex, age, etc) of subjects and controls should be included and presented in a table. Table (2): Patient's grade. Although it is assumed that this refers to "grades of activity" using SLEDAI, it is still very helpful to elaborate it clearly in the legend and footnote of table. Table (4): Correlation between IL-33 and laboratory parameters The statistical calculation using r (Spearman's correlation test) should be stated in the legend or footnote of table to increase the clarity of presentation. It should include a section of "Conclusion" in the text. Language editing is recommended to improve the clarity and coherence of this manuscript. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A few minor typos 	
Optional/General comments	Thank you for offering me the opportunity to review this research article. I hope my comment can help improve this manuscript.	

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

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hak Yung Ng
Department, University & Country	China