



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_47557
Title of the Manuscript:	Association of T-786C and 27 bp (4b/4a) polymorphism of endothelial nitric oxide synthase gene with obesity in Egypt
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sd-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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 manuscript requires full revision as regard the punctuation and sentence structure.</p> <p>In the abstract: All cases showed that there were no significant difference between cases and controls regarding to their chemical lab's analysis (TG, Cholesterol, LDL and HDL, however, the results showed a significant change. The polymorphism details are not clear. What (The age of onset) means? Significant variation about age is a problem and it is well known that aging is associated with obesity. So the authors need to explain how to compare 2 variables in the same study. The discussion needs to focus on the authors work and try to confirm or deny the aim of the study not to compare with others. I can not find informed consent from the individuals shared in the study and this is a great ethical problem. I think the blood samples were too much to be taken for these measurements.</p>	<p>First of all I appreciate all your comments and I would like to thank you very much for your valuable comments that help to improve the papers a lot: I made the necessary adjustments to the article and I hope manuscript gets your admiration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion reformed (done) • Participation was voluntary and was acquired from each participant prior to sample collection. Confidentiality of all participants was maintained and Samples were collected under authority of in Specialized Medical Hospital Mansoura University, Egypt • Material and method corrected
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The results are not well presented. If figures can express the results, it would be better. The introduction and the discussion used the same paragraphs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results, introduction and discussion were totally reformed
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No.