



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_28039
Title of the Manuscript:	Serum MiR-377 and MiR-29a in type II Diabetic patients with Diabetic Nephropathy.
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

PART 1: 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 aim of this study was to analyse the relationship between miR-377, miR-29a and diabetic nephropathy. It is demonstrated that serum level of miR-377 is increased whereas that of miR-29a is reduced in diabetic patients with macroalbuminuria in comparison to those with microalbuminuria and non-diabetic healthy controls. In addition, serum TGF-beta1 is increased in diabetic patients with macroalbuminuria. Both miRNAs presented a good diagnostic value as evidenced by high sensitivity and selectivity in ROC analysis. The topic addressed in this study is interesting and significant. The results are of interest. However, there are some concerns which should be further addressed. 1) More details about diabetic patients should be provided. In particular, the information about therapy and other non-renal complications are significant since both could affect miR concentrations. 2) Was the quality of isolated miRNA verified? If so, the respective method should be described. 3) eGFR values should be calculated. 4) Are the differences in both miRNAs between control and microalbuminuria groups significant? 5) It should be specified if both diabetic subgroups were pooled for correlation analyses or these analyses were performed only in the macroalbuminuria subgroup. 6) Because several correlations have been	1) I returned to the papers of our patients in the hospital, got these informations and wrote in the manuscript. 2) Yes, the quality of isolated miRNA is verified and I mentioned it in details. 3) I did not find eGFR in the papers of our patients in the hospital 4) The differences in both miRNAs between control and microalbuminuria groups are not significant; I added this point in the manuscript. 5) The correlations were done in both diabetic subgroups (Macroalbuminuria and microalbuminuria, the two groups together), I added this point in the manuscript. 6) I added the multivariate regression analysis in the manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	demonstrated, the multivariate regression analysis would be highly appreciated.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) The aim of the study should be presented at the end of the Abstract. 2) The results and methods should not be repeated in the Discussion	1) Ok, I did 2) Ok, I did
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		