



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_24489
Title of the Manuscript:	Disruption of disulfide bonds as a cause of insulin resistance in D.M 2
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This paper has no data provided. Is this paper a review paper or theory paper? It is impossible to review this paper if this is a primary research paper. If this is a review paper, it lacks the literature supporting the conclusion. If this is a theory paper, it lacks logics supporting the conclusion.	The consternation of the reviewer is understandable. The article type, on insistence by the submission editor was chosen from the list of 14 supplied as "commentaries and opinions", which should have been communicated to the reviewer by the submission editor. It is seen that the column ment above is left blank. "A stich in time saves nine" It is surprising that the reviewer could not see the purpose of the author as proposing a new theory/ hypothesis even after going (?)through the paper. Data looked for in such papers is but natural to be absent. Sorry for the inconvenience, the paper has put you in, sir.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		