



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_37785
Title of the Manuscript:	Acute phase reactant profile of subjects with prediabetes and type 2 diabetes mellitus.
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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	The manuscript is incomplete for publication as a scientific paper. 1. Subjects Characteristics of the 3 groups including age, gender, body mass index, and so on should be shown. Other diseases like hypertension and dyslipidemia, if any, should also be described. 2. Statistical assessment is not correctly performed according to the method section. 3. Results No statistical assessments are described about the results in Figs. 1 and 2 in spite of the description in the method section. In Table 1, "Correlation" is misused, and the result of ANOVA is not properly expressed (e.g. post hoc analysis is not performed despite the explanation as in the text). Correlations among the variables including body mass index and so on in all the 3 groups may be assessed. 4. Discussion Please explain possible reasons why the present study did not demonstrate the differences in UA levels among the 3 groups as compared with the previous reports.	Sir/Madam, 1. We have explained the age and gender distribution in the three study groups in the revised manuscript of the article. We have not taken anthropometric measurements of any of the subjects in this study, so have not commented on the same. As mentioned under Materials and methods, we have excluded individuals with any acute or chronic illness, which means care was taken to exclude individuals with hypertension. Dyslipidemia is a common feature of diabetes, but our study is not in any way related to evaluation of lipid profile in the three groups and we haven't estimated any of the lipid profile parameters and therefore not commented on it. 2. The statistical analysis has been done by a professional Biostatistician and after consultation he has assured us the apt statistical tools are used to analyse the results of the study, though the details of the same has not been discussed in the article. 3. The term correlation was wrongly used to denote significance at the footnote of Table 1, we have rectified it in the revised manuscript. The detail discussion of figure 1 and 2 is included in revised manuscript. As described under limitation of our study we did not do any correlation analysis between the study parameters owing to the fact that the sample size is too small. And we have not measures any anthropometric parameters in our study and so the correlation of the same is not done. 4. As per your suggestion we have tried our best and given relevant explanation along with reference, for uric acid levels in the three groups in the revised manuscript
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		