

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_80481
Title of the Manuscript:	A study of Adenosine Deaminase Activity and its isoenzymes in COPD patients with acute exacerbations
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>)

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>In the introduction part</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The research questions and purpose were not mentioned. Please consider this point.2. The significance of exploring ADA determinants among COPD patients was not adequately addressed; please strengthen your introduction part to convene the reader. <p>In the method part,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. how the sample selected (sampling strategy) was not addressed. I think the author used the convenience sampling method. You can add it if appropriate. Also, the authors need to explain how the participants were distributed into three groups.2. In the study, many people were exposed to laboratory tests and radiology tests that could induce harm for them. However, the authors did not mention any ethical considerations regarding this point. <p>In the analysis part,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. the author said that they convert qualitative data into numbers. Is this true? There is no way to convert qualitative data into numbers. Also, the analysis for qualitative data differ from quantitative data (numbers). <p>In the discussion part,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. the author needs to explain their findings in the contexts of the previous agreement and disagreement studies.2. As well as, the authors compare their findings with previous studies (as Austine et al. & El-Shimy et al.). In contrast, the control group of both studies was not mentioned in the paragraph. Please just add who was the control group in these studies.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Done2. Done <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Done2. Done <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Done <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Done2. Done
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In the 1st paragraph, the researcher said COPD is a major earth morbidity and mortality, while it is not. Please revise the sentence.2. In many sites, the word Qualitative were mentioned meanwhile the study was Quantitative. I suggest replacing it accordingly.3. In the inclusion criteria part, the criteria for Group 3 were reported while it was not for groups 1 & 2. I suggest adding it if available.4. Exclusion criteria are limited only for diseases, while no criteria for participants themselves. I suggest rewriting it and focusing on exclusion criteria for participants.5. In all tables, you mention a mark (*) while no notes were explained what did this mean? Does it mean p-value < 0.01 or p < 0.05. please adjust the p values in all tables and text accordingly.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Done2. Done3. Done4. Done5. Done
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Why does the researcher wants to compare non-smoker and COPD patients and asymptomatic smokers. In the whole study, there was no declaration for this relationship and the need to examine it.2. Many sentence repetition in inclusion criteria part and discussion, please focus on the inclusion criteria for sample rather than a definition of COPD3. In the result part, page 4, paragraph 1, you mentioned that ANOVA is a test used to compare means and SD. While it used to compare means not SD. I suggest removing SD from the sentence.4. Please approximate all numbers to two or three decimal digits.5. In the last part of the discussion part, it is recommended to add the limitations and strengths of the study.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Done2. Done3. Done4. Done5. Done

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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> In the study, many people were exposed to laboratory tests and radiology tests that could induce harm for them. However, the authors did not mention any ethical considerations regarding this point. Please add it accordingly.	