

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76792
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Pulsed Electro-Magnetic Field (PEMF) Therapy and Conventional Physiotherapy on Lipid Profile- A Randomised Control Trial
Type of the Article	Study Protocol

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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no evidence that PEMF could maintain or improve the lipid profile in the introduction section. The reviewer suggests adding evidence based on <i>in vitro</i> or <i>in vivo</i> studies that support the author's hypothesis. 2. Please add evidence regarding how the restoration of positive and negative charges of the cells by PEMF influence the lipid profile. 3. Information regarding the calculation of the sample size is missing (which confidence level, power, ratio of exposed to unexposed groups, hypothetical percentage of outcome among the controls and attrition rate were considered) 4. Since tobacco smoking is a major risk factor for cardiovascular disease, the reviewer strongly suggests excluding smokers from the study. Additionally, a questionnaire regarding life habit styles should be performed in all recruited participant 5. Authors should consider no significant differences in the Body-Mass-Index (BMI) and nutritional status between the Groups included in the study. 6. Please add specifications regarding the PEMF that will be used in the study (e.g. device, frequencies, etc.). Additionally, please explain why the participants from Group 1 will be exposure to PEMF for 30 minutes, on which previous observation or study has based this exposure. 7. Please add information regarding the assays that will be used to measure blood lipid profile. 8. The review strongly suggests including a schematic overview of the study design for better representation and visualization of the 3 weeks intervention (1 week aerobics follow 2 weeks resistance training) and sampling time points. Additionally, an illustration of PEMF device and how it will be applied and placed during the treatments could help to improve the publication. 9. The Student t test assumes normal distribution of the data. Due to the low number of participants that will be included in the study, the authors should demonstrate normal distributions of the data set or apply a non-parametric test to compare the two study classes. 10. The review strongly suggests considerer in Group 2 (control) including a placebo PEMF device. The devices should not differ in design or handling and the participant and physician involved will not know what condition was assigned. Therefore, allocation concealment and double-blinding are assured and unblinding could be performed after data at the end of the study. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please change "20 in group 1 and 20 in Group 2." to "20 in Group 1 and 20 in Group 2." 2. References missing "There is a direct relationship between cholesterol levels and ischemic heart diseases. So, we need to keep the cholesterol levels in normal range to prevent ischemic heart diseases. Studies have proved that exercise have helped in reducing the cholesterol levels." 	

Review Form 1.6

	3. Missing abbreviation for PEMF in the introduction section. 4. Please change "The membrane of a healthy cell has both..." to "The membrane of a healthy cell has both..."	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Romina Aspera-Werz
Department, University & Country	Eberhard Karl University of Tübingen, Germany