



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Biochemistry Research &amp; Review</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_46192
Title of the Manuscript:	The association of Cord blood telomere biology with mother's education
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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>	<p><b>Abstract:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Methods:</b> To be rewritten, not comprehensive enough to warrant better understanding. Include description of participants, inclusion criteria, study design, statistical package used, etc.</li> <li>2. <b>Results:</b> Can be made neater with emphasis on parameters related to the aim/objectives of the study.</li> <li>3. <b>Conclusion:</b> Should be made smarter and not a mere repetition of the result. Avoid p value.</li> </ol> <p><b>Keywords:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Change to Cord Blood Telomere</li> <li>2. Relative Telomere Length</li> <li>3. Genetic remodelling</li> <li>4. Fetal Telomere</li> </ol> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. References 11,12,13 should b written as 11-13.</li> <li>2. The purpose of the article should be modified- you cannot use this study 'to review the state of knowledge.....' Rather, the original study can 'determine' or 'evaluate' the variation in RTL with maternal educational level'. Or something similar to this.</li> <li>3. You did not identify and knowledge gap, so what doo you want to fill?</li> <li>4. The results did not achieve you aim of 'risk-prediction'.</li> <li>5. It appears that you have included too many items in your objectives.</li> </ol> <p><b>Methods</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Was this a prospective study?</li> <li>2. Who were the participants in this study and at what point was the recruitment?</li> <li>3. State the inclusion and exclusion criteria.</li> <li>4. How soon after delivery was the evaluation?</li> <li>5. What was the sampling method?</li> <li>6. How did you calculate the sample size?</li> <li>7. Since you were interested in the influence of maternal education, it would have been preferable to have equal numbers of low and high educational levels.</li> <li>8. What is the scientific basis for the categorization of the educational levels into high and low? Provide a reference please.</li> <li>9. How did you ensure quality control of the laboratory results?</li> </ol> <p><b>Results:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How were the socioeconomic ctatus categorized? Include and provide a reference in the methods.</li> <li>2. Table1: the portions with 'NA' should be zero.</li> <li>3. The p-values should not be in between the rows- should be on first row of the frequency for the specific parameter evaluated for.</li> <li>4. What informed the categorization of the gestational age? This is not scientific- you lumped preterm and term babies together. Check out a scientific categorization.</li> <li>5. Figure 1and 2shouldbedeleted- they are repetitions of table 2.</li> <li>6. Table 2:the comparison is not scientific- I suggest a comparison of Maternal RTL for low to high education as well as comparison of cord RTL of low tohigh education. Statistical analysis should be for each set of parameter instead of the current format. Create columns to show the</li> </ol>	<p><b>Abstract:</b> Comments incorporated</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> Not available on MeSH NCBI Remodelling added</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> Incorporated in original article</p> <p><b>Methods:</b> Few comments already present Rest incorporated It's a consecutive sampling so it was difficult to have equal numbers of low and high educational levels.</p> <p><b>Results: Changes incorporated</b></p> <p>Few comments are already present. Figure 1 is emphasis of the table2 Figure 2 deleted table 2:corrected, columns for p value cannot be made it will make the</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>statistical models for companion and separate answers for each parameter. The p-values are incorrect because the correct data were not compared.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b> Not acceptable because a review of the results will change the information for companion and change the trend also.</p> <p><b>References</b> Should be check for compliance with the format for this journal.</p> <p><b>Sponsorship</b> Authors to include a statement on the sponsorship of the study.</p>	<p>table very broad, have highlighted the p values. all the p-values are correct(changed thrice)</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Changes incorporated</p> <p><b>References:</b> Already VANCOUVER</p> <p><b>Sponsorship:</b> Acknowledged in acknowledgment.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>