



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_28595
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of 25-hydroxy Vitamin D and Hemodialysis on Vitamin D Axis in Sudanese Renal Failure Patients
Type of the Article	Short 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1) Small sample size (only 16 patients) 2) Regarding the matching of age between the control and the study group, the authors said it is matched in spite that the mean age of the control group is 32.4 (21-53) and that of the study group 47.2 (28-70) years with older patients in the study group and it is documented that there is age related changes in vitamin D metabolism and its related hormones in addition to changes in calcium level with age. 3) The authors did not mention the dose and duration of 25 hydroxyvitamin D administration which is very important. Also, what is the baseline value of 25 hydroxyvitamin D before supplementation? 4) The duration of dialysis can affect the results. How many years were the patients on dialysis? 5) The authors did not mention the calcium concentration in the dialysate solution which affects the concentration of calcium after dialysis. 6) The authors did not mention if the patients were on calcium supplementation or not. 7) Line 182: Similar to our finding that there was negative correlation between 25-hydroxyvitamin D and PTH. The authors did not mention in correlations in the results	1- For that reason we have applied for short research article. It can be considered as a pilot study (done in the manuscript) 2- The age matching was done range wise (less than 20, 21- 44, 45- 64, and 65 or more) not on individual base for that reason the mean age was different. 3- The duration is not included in the questionnaire and the dose was..... 4- The duration of dialysis is very variable so also it is not analyzed. However, it was ranging from some months to nine years. 5- The concentration of the calcium in the dialysate was 1.5 mmol/L. It is introduced in the material and methods and in the Results and Discussion. 6- the patients were on calcium 7- I have rephrased the statement in a way by which we may not add a p or r value.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and where is the <i>r</i> and <i>p</i> of this correlation?	
Minor REVISION comments	At the end of the paragraph at line 37 there was no reference	A reference is added, however, I did not add a new one the information was obtained from reference 8 (Seije Fukomoto) it is changed to number 4
Optional/General comments		