



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_51456
Title of the Manuscript:	Serum Levels of Zinc and Copper in Cases of Juvenile Idiopathic Arthritis
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=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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This is a relevant topic, but the manuscript was not clearly written and did not explain the findings. A more robust criterion should have been used to define disease activity and it would be important to explain how the control group was formed</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1) ABSTRACT</p> <p>“Out of the forty patients 17 were in activity and 23 were without activity” How you measured activity? Conclusion _ I think you have to replace “juvenile idiopathic arthritis” instead of “rheumatoid arthritis”.</p> <p>2) INTRODUCTION</p> <p>First paragraph “It arises before 16 years of age and lasts more than 6 months (1)” I think that there is a mistake.. may be in translation</p> <p>3)SUBJECTS AND METHODS</p> <p>First paragraph “However, patients with other rheumatologic diseases, and patients with rheumatoid arthritis with a disease onset of less than one year duration were excluded.” I didn't understand this sentence. Please clarify.</p> <p>Please, explain how and from which population the controls were selected.</p> <p>Second paragraph Please, explain how the the disease activity was measured. Please, especify “liver functions” I think that its better “function” than “functions.”</p> <p>Third paragraph I suggest that a more robust criterion be used to define disease activity</p> <p>3) RESULTS</p> <p>Second paragraph</p> <p>It would be better to change “statistical significance” for “statistical difference”</p> <p>Sixth paragraph Please, change “Table 4” for “Table 3”.</p> <p>4) DISCUSSION</p> <p>Sixth paragraph It would be better to transfer part of this paragraph to the Introduction's and Materials and Methods's sections.</p> <p>Second page - last paragraph</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Please, give an explanation for the differences of your results and the results of Çaglayan and Sukru (1997)</p> <p><u>Last paragraph of discussion</u></p> <p>Please, give an explanation for the results in relation to the different medications and the serum levels of copper and zinc</p> <p>5) CONCLUSION</p> <p>Change “juvenile idiopathic arthritis” for of rheumatoid arthritis</p>	
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:	Carlos Augusto Ferreira De Andrade
Department, University & Country	Sergio Arouca National School of Public Health, Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, Brazil