



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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is poorly written and unclear. It compiles several information about the main subject but it does not show a clear connection among them. -The manuscript depicts bold statements about insulin resistance in the abstract section that are not explored or properly referenced in the body of the article ("The exogenously administered insulin restores the normal carbohydrate metabolism, by reversing the conditions that resulted in switch over to Beta oxidation, thus restoring insulin sensitivity in treated diabetics") and it does not show the connection with the title. -The introduction is too long and it does not state the aim or importance of the article (e. g. It mentions about the effectiveness of exogenous insulin in contrast to the endogenous insulin – no reference is mentioned and no connection with disulfide bond disruption is made). -The conclusion is lacking. - Moreover it presents major grammatical, spelling (heteromear-line 55, glycolysisa-line 65 etc) and punctuation mistakes which often lead to difficulties in understanding. The term theory does not apply to the subject of the article, it would be better to use the term hypothesis. -It lacks consistency in the expression of scientific terms (e. g. D. M2/ DM2/ DM 2; sub unit/ subunit etc) and in	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the reference style (see authors statements, spelling mistakes in the article titles etc)	
--	---	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Barao de Maua University Center, Brazil