

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_72164
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Sub-Clinical Hypothyroidism in Diagnosed Cases of Gallstone Disease
Type of the Article	Original 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The article deals with prevalence of Sub-Clinical Hypothyroidism in Diagnosed Cases of Gallstone Disease</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The novelty of study is not clearly stated. • All the sections in the study need to be improved • The presentation of the results needs to be improved • Discussion section is very deficient. The findings need more interpretations as the authors did not explain their finding in sufficient way and go to the conclusion. • Manuscript should be 'spell checked' and 'grammar checked.' 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delete the following sentence in abstract as it is repeated (Out of 22 patients, 19 patients (86.4%) had normal T4 levels,2 patients (9.1 %) had decreased T4 level, and 1 patient (4.5%) had increased T4 levels). 2. The abstract does not adequately reflect the findings from the work. It should be rewritten. 3. List of abbreviation might be added. 4. The abbreviation should be defined once mentioned in the text. 5. Rationale of the study is not clear in introduction section. 6. The ethical approval should be mentioned, and the number of ethical approvals should be written. 7. The explanation of the inclusion and exclusion criteria should be mentioned. 8. The type of the sample size should be mentioned. How you calculate it? Mention your references? 9. Why the authors choose this period for study (2016-2017). 10. The authors did not mention the level of significance. 11. The results should be informative and clear. 12. The tables should be self-explanatory, so change the title of the table to be more informative. 13. Remove the word (our) and make it the present or the current. 14. It is better to change some tables to graphs 15. The statistics significance should be mentioned, calculated, and described. 16. The authors mentioned that they collect data about history, sociodemographic, physical and some investigation; and these data are not reflected in the result section or discussion. 17. The discussion section needs to be supported with more updated references for each finding and discussed with others. 18. The conclusion to be re-formulated and needs to be dependent on the collected data, not generalized one. 19. Update the references, too old references to be deleted. 20. References should be written and arranged in uniform style. 21. It is suggested that authors add a section referring to Authors' Contributions. 	
Optional/General comments	None	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Mahrous A Ibrahim</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Suez Canal University, Egypt</i>