

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2830
Title of the Manuscript:	Associations of Anthropometric Parameters with Thyroid Hormone Profiles and the Serum Proteins in Healthy Young Women in the Preconception Period
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript offers valuable insights that could significantly advance our understanding of Anthropometric Parameters with Thyroid Hormone Profiles and the Serum Proteins in Healthy Young Women in the Preconception Period. Its robust methodology and comprehensive data analysis contribute to a deeper exploration of key concepts, making it a noteworthy addition to the existing literature. I appreciate its clarity and the way it addresses important gaps in current research, fostering further discussion among scientists. Overall, the manuscript not only enriches the field but also encourages collaborative efforts to build on its findings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, Addition of sample size would strengthen the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its rigorous experimental design and clear articulation of methodologies. The data presented are systematically analyzed using appropriate statistical techniques, ensuring that the conclusions drawn are well-supported. Additionally, the authors have thoroughly reviewed relevant literature, situating their findings within the broader context of the field. Overall, the attention to detail and adherence to scientific standards make this manuscript technically sound and reliable for future research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references in this manuscript are generally sufficient and include a mix of foundational and recent studies relevant to the topic. However, to enhance its depth, I would recommend incorporating additional recent studies from the past couple of years that address emerging trends or new methodologies in the field. Specific references to consider might include [insert relevant studies or authors], which provide valuable insights and could strengthen the manuscript's context. Overall, while the references are solid, a few more recent additions could enrich the discussion further.	

Review Form2

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear and concise, effectively conveying complex ideas without ambiguity. Additionally, the use of appropriate scientific terminology enhances the manuscript's credibility. However, there are a few areas where sentence structure could be improved for better flow, and minor grammatical errors could be addressed. Overall, with some revisions, the manuscript would meet the standards expected in academic publishing.</p>	
<p>Optional/Generalcomments</p>	<p>Could improve a bit in some areas.</p> <p>The manuscript presents compelling findings that contribute significantly to the field. The methodology is robust, and the results are well-analyzed. However, I recommend addressing minor language issues for clarity and flow. Additionally, incorporating more recent references could enhance the manuscript's relevance. Overall, it's a strong contribution, and with these adjustments, it will be even more impactful.</p>	

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:	Don Mathew
Department, University & Country	PMCH, India