

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_88787
Title of the Manuscript:	Bioinformatics Analysis of LDLR Gene Mutation That Shed A New Light On Red Yeast Rice Monacolin K Treatment – Systematic Review
Type of the 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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-The article is of scientific interest, however it has important observations that would prevent publication.-The abstract is structured with a molecular objective in demonstrating a hypothesis from a molecular point of view, therefore with this logic the conclusions must have this molecular intentionality; however, the authors conclude in a therapeutic argument, remember that if the intention is to verify the therapeutic value of an active principle, the research design is a clinical trial.-The article has strengths and several points of value, however, many weaknesses and difficulties that have not been mentioned, remember that mentioning the weak points, biases and difficulties of the study do not detract from value, on the contrary, they clarify and add value.-The objective is not met with the results or conclusions.- The article does not meet the characteristics of a systematic review.-The results are not analyzed by statistical devices or tests of statistical validity.-Through these observations, I motivate the authors to rethink their interesting topic with adequate structure and coherence	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Does not apply	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Does not apply	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juan Miguel Alemán Iñiguez
Department, University & Country	Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Ecuador