

Review of: "Investigation of the effects of wet cupping therapy on some inflammatory factors in patients affected by non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD): A quasi-experimental trial study with self-controls"

Adryana Cordeiro

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

Dear chief editor,

According to the review, I suggest for not publish this manuscript. Major and important revisions need to be done, mainly in methods and results that compromise completely this publication.

Through my understanding of the manuscript, I suppose that the aim goal of the study was to investigate the effects of wet cupping therapy on some inflammatory cytokines to certify if this therapy impacts on the inflammatory state of the liver of patients affected by MAFLD. However, in any part of the manuscript the aim is clear, neither the hypothesis of the study.

Introduction:

1. The author described the new term of NAFLD, as MAFLD but in all manuscript mentioned as NAFLD, continued with "old" term. Therefore, is necessary to substitute NAFLD for MAFLD in all it.
2. First, need to write the words in extension form + abbreviation at the first time. Example: TNF, IL-6...
3. Necessary only to insert abbreviations instead of extension form, if the authors already mentioned before. These corrections need to be done in all manuscript.
4. Substitute the word obese to obesity. We cannot use stigma words in the manuscript. Pay attention in all manuscript, also.
5. Correct term is physical exercise.
6. Necessary to describe more about cut wet therapy in introduction.

Material and Methods

1. Need to replace to results information about mean age.
2. What is about inclusion criteria? I miss it.
3. Need to describe how was the calculation of sample size, according to?
4. To become clear the method of the study, important insert a figure as a flowchart of study.
5. About analysis of blood pressure and calculation of BMI, WC, TG and GGT what are the times that all were evaluated? Before? And after treatment? Important information that the authors missed. Also, miss some biochemical

exams information.

6. Need to improve the description about wet cupping procedure, seems to be a highlight of the study but it was very unclear in methods.

Results

1. In all figures, was not mentioned the time of treatments. Neither in Methods. Pre, After, 1^o, 2^o, 3^o???
2. The presentation of the results in table 1 is not correct. These are data, not result presentation.
3. Superficial and confused way to present results without clear statistical analysis.

Discussion

What was the principal result of the study? Was not described in the beginning of this part.

The authors need to improve the discussion. An idea is to discuss the findings and connect with other author's results and mainly connect them with possible mechanisms that could explain or/and could be related with.

About references more than 50% of them are less than 2017, it means more than 5 years. Necessary an update on it.

Best regards,