



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_66503
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of Alanine Transaminase (ALT), Alkaline Phosphate (ALP) and Aspartate (AST) irrespective of Dietary Supplementation, Body Mass Index and Nature of Exercise
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Spelling and grammar need to be carefully checked, and the authors may benefit from an English language copyediting service.</li> <li>2. The placement of citations needs to be modified to allow the reader to identify which parts are cited from the references.</li> <li>3. All the terms and concepts throughout the manuscript should be uniformed, for example, in the section "Methods and Materials" the authors used the term low-intensity exercise, whereas in the section "Findings and Discussion" and "Study Background" the authors used the term "aerobic exercise". Are the two terms mean the same type of exercise?</li> <li>4. The "study background" should be a brief literature review of the existing studies already published in the field and could demonstrate the authors' strong understanding of the debates or scholarship in the area. This section of this manuscript was more like a textbook excerpt than a literature review, and the logical connection between the content and the authors' research was not strong. I suggest that more references should be added to verify some statements in this section. For example, it would be useful to insert the following bibliographic references that are related to these sentences,  <i>"Earlier epidemiological studies have confirmed that exercise has numerous health benefits."</i>                      Reference  <a href="#">Zhang, T.; Lu, G.; Wu, X.Y. Associations between physical activity, sedentary behaviour and self-rated health among the general population of children and adolescents: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Public Health 2020, 20, 1343, doi:10.1186/s12889-020-09447-1.</a>  <a href="#">Gesinde, B. (2019). Could Physical Activity Have an Impact on the Incidence or Prevention of Diabetes-Related Complications? A Review of the Evidence. Physical Activity and Health, 3(1), 57–62. DOI: http://doi.org/10.5334/paah.32</a>  <a href="#">Song, Y., Ren, F., Sun, D., Wang, M., Baker, J. S., István, B., &amp; Gu, Y. (2020). Benefits of exercise on influenza or pneumonia in older adults: A systematic review. International journal of environmental research and public health, 17(8), 2655. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17082655</a>  <i>"High intensity exercise may cause the damage of skeletal muscles similarly it is also evident high intensity exercise induce free radicals which leads oxidative damage."</i>                      Reference:  <a href="#">Paschalis, V.; Koutedakis, Y.; Jamurtas, A.Z.; Mougios, V.; Baltzopoulos, V. Equal volumes of high and low intensity of eccentric exercise in relation to muscle damage and performance. J Strength Cond Res 2005, 19, 184-188, doi:10.1519/R-14763.1.</a> </li> <li>5. The "study background" would benefit from substantial shortening (about 50%). A focus on the reasons for the used methods would be helpful. And the part of the indicator selection should explain the logical relationship between the change of the indicators and the thesis of this research clearly, the authors need to add some references to introduce BMI and dietary supplements, which were two important variables of the research.</li> <li>6. The question raised by the author in the "Justification of the Study" section, which was that "Is there is any effect of exercise on liver function in terms of ALT, ALP, and AST?", had a conceptual difference between the topic of the research. The questions or hypotheses raised by the author must be completely consistent with the content and topic of the research. That is to say, the results of the research should be able to verify the hypotheses raised by the author or answer the questions raised by the author.</li> <li>7. It might be beneficial and more in line with the writing conventions of scientific papers</li> </ol>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>to combine first three sections as the “introduction” of this manuscript.</p> <p>8. In the section of “Methods and Materials”, the information provided should be able to make the trial reproducible. However, some important information of the research was missing. For example, firstly, information on the sampling, blinding, concealing, allocation, and randomization of the participants was not mentioned in this section. Secondly, the details of the exercise, such as the intensity indices (%VO<sub>2</sub>max or %HRmax), the repetitions, the sets, and the total volume load, were not provided, therefore, the terms “high intensity” and “low intensity” were not clearly defined. Thirdly, the blood collecting time and information of the testing instruments were not provided. The author should cite some studies from the field of clinical examination to make the method more consistent with the specification.</p> <p>9. In the “Presentation and Analysis of Data” section, the structure should be more consistent with the convention of scientific research and the frame given by the “Methods and Materials” section.</p> <p>10. According to the information above this section, there should be 5 comparisons in the results of this research if the author used the statistical methods of univariate analysis, HIE + Supplements. vs LIE + Supplements. vs CG + Supplements. HIE + Non-Supplements. vs LIE + Non-Supplements. vs CG + Non-Supplements. HIE + Supplements. vs HIE + Non-Supplement. LIE + Supplements. vs LIE + Non-Supplements. CG + Supplements. vs CG + Non-Supplements. It would be beneficial to add a logistic regression in the data analysis, because that the intensity of the exercise and the intaking of the supplement were classified variables while the indices of ALT, ALP, and AST were continuous variables.</p> <p>11. The data processing and analysis part of this paper was too simple to prove the author's point of view forcefully. For example, an additional Pearson correlation analysis may be required to determine whether BMI and indicators are related.</p> <p>12. In the “Findings and Discussion” section, the discussion needs extensive revision and additions to accurately describe the clinical implications of your findings. The three paragraphs that are provided summarizing the evidence did not provide meaning to your findings. However, whilst the emphasis on mathematical findings is convincing, there was sometimes a lack of ‘descriptive’ evidence particularly in the results and discussion which could help the reader to understand and interpret the findings presented in tables. The author should elaborate on the practical and clinical interpretation of the findings for readers, particularly in the discussion which has not drawn on other literature at all.</p>	
--	--	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The “Purpose” part in the abstract should be concise, announcing the topic and providing the question of the research, some sentences were not the purpose of the research.</li> <li>2. There was some important information missed in the “Method” part in the abstract. For example, what was the interval between the blood collection and the exercise, and whether the allocation of participants was randomized?</li> <li>3. The “Result” part should provide the differences within groups with their P-values to make the abstract more clear.</li> <li>4. The “Conclusion” part in the abstract mentioned the intake of dietary supplements, however, the “Method” part didn’t mention a group in which the participants intake dietary supplements.</li> <li>5. The title used the term “nature of exercise”, whereas the section of “Objective of the Study” used the term “high intensity exercise”, these two terms didn’t share the same concept.</li> <li>6. The title of the tables in the “Presentation and Analysis of Data” section should be a noun phrase, not a gerund. And it is suggested to add a table of the characteristics of the participants in the “Presentation and Analysis of Data” section, providing the necessary and basic information of each group.</li> <li>7. There are too many tables in the “Presentation and Analysis of Data” section, some information could be illustrated by graphs.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>In general, the structure of the manuscript should be modified, both the method of the research and the data processing should be revised, and extensive editing of the English language and writing style is required.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Yaodong Gu</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Ningbo University, China</b></p>