

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	The Efficacy of Nanocurcumin Supplementation on Insulin Resistance, Lipids, Inflammatory Factors, and Nesfatin among Obese Patients with Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease (NAFLD): A Trial Protocol
AUTHORS	Jazayeri-Tehrani, Seyed Ali; Rezayat, Seyed Mehdi; Mansouri, Siavash; Qorbani, Mostafa; Alavian, SM; Daneshi-Maskooni, Milad; Hosseinzadeh-Attar, Mohammad Javad

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Tarantino, Giovanni Federico II University Medical School of Naples, Italy
REVIEW RETURNED	17-Apr-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	Combine the 5th with the 13th exclusion criterion being quite similar
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Dr. Hesham N. Mustafa King Abdulaziz University, Faculty of Medicine, Anatomy Department, Ground Floor Room: 821 (A).
REVIEW RETURNED	02-May-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Title The Efficacy of Nanocurcumin Supplementation on Insulin Resistance, Lipids, Inflammatory Factors and Nesfatin among Obese Patients with Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease (NAFLD): A Trial Protocol</p> <p>For the editor I advise the editor to send the research for the reviewer as a blind review. So it's better to avoid showing the names of the authors to the reviewers and their affiliation.</p> <p>Plagiarism iThenticate report is 36% which is not accepted.</p> <p>Abstract 1. The text needs language editing.</p> <p>Introduction 1. The text needs language editing. 2. (5% <) Explain??? 3. The important problem in this section is the failure to make a clear statement of research purpose. So, the final part in Introduction section should be re-organized, according to the following</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>guidelines. The author should summarize the results and findings of other studies in this area, and state the main objective and purpose.</p> <p>4. What research had been done? 5. What is unknown about the topic? 6. How will this study differ? 7. What other studies on similar topics might influence this study? 8. How are the questions addressed? 9. What is the outline of research design?</p> <p>Material and Methods Ok</p> <p>Results</p> <p>Discussion The trial limitations should be addressed in more details.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Abbreviations: NCOVA correct</p> <p>References 10 out of 41 references are old Dear author, these days the author must read an upto date research within the last 10 years as a maximum. All old references must be omitted as the knowledge is changing from day to day.</p>
--	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer #1:

Comment 1:

Combine the 5th with the 13th exclusion criterion being quite similar

Response:

The 5th and the 13th exclusion criterion were combined.

The comment was very relevant. Thanks for your attention.

Reviewer #2:

Comment 1:

Plagiarism iThenticate report is 36% which is not accepted.

Response:

Plagiarism iThenticate report was 6 % without “title page” and “references”. It was edited by one of the highly qualified subject-expert native English speaking editors at NativeEnglishEdit.com (Refer Code: EE RE -1396-3334402-AJAZYERI).

Comment 2:

Abstract: 1. The text needs language editing.

Response:

The article was edited for proper English language, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and overall style by one of the highly qualified subject-expert native English speaking editors at NativeEnglishEdit.com (Refer Code: EE RE -1396-3334402-AJAZYERI).

Comment 3:

Introduction: 1. The text needs language editing. 2. (5% <) Explain??? 3. The important problem in this section is the failure to make a clear statement of research purpose. So, the final part in Introduction section should be re-organized, according to the following guidelines. The author should summarize the results and findings of other studies in this area, and state the main objective and purpose. 4. What research had been done? 5. What is unknown about the topic? 6. How will this study differ? 7. What other studies on similar topics might influence this study? 8. How are the questions addressed? 9. What is the outline of research design?

Response:

The article was edited for proper English language, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and overall style by one of the highly qualified subject-expert native English speaking editors at NativeEnglishEdit.com (Refer Code: EE RE -1396-3334402-AJAZAYERI). Two primary sentences of the Introduction were reworded and modified. The final part of Introduction was reworded.

Comment 4:

Discussion: The trial limitations should be addressed in more details.

Response:

The trial limitations were described in more details.

Comment 5:

Abbreviations: NCOVA correct

Response:

“ANCOVA” is correct according to “abbreviations.com”. Ref: [ANCOVA. Abbreviations.com. STANDS4 LLC, 2017. Web. 8 May 2017. .]

Comment 6:

References: 10 out of 41 references are old. Dear author, these days the author must read an up to date research within the last 10 years as a maximum. All old references must be omitted as the knowledge is changing from day to day.

Response:

The references were updated.

The comments were very relevant. Thanks for your attention.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Hesham N. Mustafa King Abdulaziz University, Faculty of Medicine, Anatomy Department, Ground Floor Room: 821 (A).
REVIEW RETURNED	26-May-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors addressed the inquiries point by point. All the corrections are made clearly And the over all Manuscript is now accepted.
-------------------------	--