Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_85930**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Low HDL levels as a major risk factor of acute myocardial infarction**
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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	**The manuscript title clearly states what the study is all about, however there are gaps to be filled in the area of problem statement and justification for this study. The methodology was not clearly or explicit enough as the author did not show what was done for the 100 patients recruited for the study. The operational definition of low HDL was not stated and among the patients recruited, how many have low HDL? This also was not reflected in the manuscript. The results should include the demography of the patients, how many males, how many females, age ranges, which age range has low HDL……. , the identified predictors of MI before the table of logistic regression. The author did not relate his findings to studies that had been done in this area before but rather talked about niacin and statin treatment.** **The conclusion cannot be inferred from the write-up. The references however were well written, although some of the references were not recent.**	
Minor REVISION comments	It will be better for the author when introducing a term for the first time, to write it out in full before the abbreviation. Some of the similar terms used should have been mentioned as well	
Optional/General comments	The concept was good but the manuscript was not scientifically robust and technically sound	

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?	***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Oluwaserimi Adewumi Ajetunmobi**
Department, University & Country	**Federal Teaching Hospital, Nigeria**