



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_39263
Title of the Manuscript:	GENE EXPRESSIONS AND POLYMORPHISMS OF NOVEL BIOMARKERS IN 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>)

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) The Abstract should be re-written to become more informative regarding the results of this study. 2) The manuscript requires thorough language revision. 3) Control group is not described. 4) Page 2, line 6 from the bottom: "microalbuminuria" means urinary excretion of low amounts of albumin. One cannot measure "microalbumin". 5) Page 2, line 5 from the bottom: it is unclear what are "three study groups" 6) More details about the methods should be presented. The methods of DNA isolation and sequencing, qRT-PCR, microalbuminuria, eGFR calculation, etc. should be described. 7) Table 3: statistical significance of the differences should be presented. Why both SD and SEM values are presented? In table 4 it is unclear to which comparisons the specific p values refer. 8) What is the rationale behind the measurement of mRNA in the blood? The expression of specific genes in blood cells may be completely different than in kidney cells. It would be of interest to measure the level of at least selected proteins such as IL-10 in the blood. 9) Results and Discussion sections should be separated. 10) Conclusion section is confusing and not directly related to the Results. This section should be shortened and more focused on the Results. 11) It is not clearly stated if and which gene polymorphisms were actually measured.	1. Modified 2. Revised 3. In this study control group in expressions and polymorphisms used as references, so reference data need not to described. 4. Urinary excretion of albumin is called microalbuminuria and in this microalbumin is measured by Nephelometry 5. Corrected as " three groups" 6. Methods of expressions and rtPCR are given in diagram. Diagrammatic presentation is more informative. 7. Its about age and duration if DM, p value can be calculated but its of no use. 8. m-RNA is expressions exhibited after mutations. Overall expressions indicate the status of mutations in blood, it differ from kidney tissue which is limitation of this study. 9. There are many tables and discussion is written under each result tables, as recommended it is separated. 10.
Minor REVISION comments	1) There is the discrepancy between the Abstract and the main text ([page 2) regarding the number of patients included (3-45 yrs and 30-70 yrs, respectively)	Total no. of subjects are 241 on both pages. On both pages presentation is in different ways.
Optional/General comments		