

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_100950
Title of the Manuscript:	Diagnosis of anti-citrullinated protein antibody negative rheumatoid arthritis depending on pathology associated with clinical phenotypes
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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>Yes, it has negative result but it may help in diagnosis and intervention.</p> <p>Title could be a little more clear . It doesn't state the motive of the study so clearly.</p> <p>It's too short. Material methods, result and conclusion may be more inclusive as per journal guidelines for authors.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>All except reference no 7 which is more than 2 decades old.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes,it is adequate.	
Optional/General comments	<p>1. Abstract may be improved.</p> <p>2. Introduction needs to be rephrased.</p> <p>3. The abbreviations need to be written in expanded form at least once in the manuscript.</p> <p>4. Study design and study population need to be described more clearly.</p> <p>5. Ethical approval needs to be taken and mentioned.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Swikruti Behera
Department, University & Country	Manipal- TATA Medical College, India