



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_24760
Title of the Manuscript:	Cystatin C- an early diagnostic biomarker of diabetic kidney disease
Type of the Article	Original Research 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

PART1: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The study should have included a wider range of serum markers including blood urea, Na, K ... etc as extensively present in the literature in combination with cystatin C The study should have taken in consideration, the degree of control of diabetes as indicated by Hb A c as well as sugar level...etc The study in its form is too limited and stating a finding that has already become a fact	I have already estimated blood urea nitrogen values for this study and I am now including this. I have not estimated other parameters.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The English language needs extensive revision In the conclusion In the conclusion of the abstract: Remove the first sentence about diabetes: conclusion should be confined to the results of your work For any abbreviation, you should mention the full name the first time with the abbreviation between brackets Numbers at the beginning of a sentence should be in letters	Modifications done.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		Comments in PDF file: We chose P value cutoff .01 because we wanted to assess parameters effectively and to get a single better marker. I have written P value as per guidelines given in the template (e.g. .01 instead of 0.01) Regarding title of table- We have not taken healthy controls. Both groups contain type 2 diabetic patients. All other modifications done.