



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1. The English has not been corrected, there are still numerous grammar and stylistic errors, e.g. "Inadequate tools are failed to recognize early detection...", "This study includes 241 subjects (118 male, 123 women, and age ranges 30-70 years) were included...", "It indicates proximal tubular injury in diabetic conditions suggested in literature that high glucose"... In conclusion it was suggested that for early detection of renal injury by analyzing routine renal markers (blood urea nitrogen and serum/ urine creatinine) are not enough", etc, etc 2. The typos have not been corrected, e.g. "delation" rt-PCR", "hyperglycemias", "diabetic mellitus", "recommended" and many other 3. Despite the reviewer's suggestion, the Authors have not modified the introduction. The reason why they have focused just on CD36 and LDLr should be clearly stated. 4. General descriptions of methods have been added. However, the Authors have not presented their own specific working conditions such as primer sequences, melting temperatures, amount of RNA used for RT-PCR, reagent sources and concentrations etc. Instead, they have copied and slightly modified the TaKaRa User Manual and the text from Techcouncil webpage. The text is presented without indicating the source. On the other hand, publishing general charts and procedures makes little sense because anyone who is interested in method principles, may find them anywhere else. Original research article should present specific conditions of experiments performed by the authors. Short information on the way of blood collection has been included in the author's response but it should be added in the Methods paragraph. 5. Despite the reviewer's suggestion, presentation and discussion of results has not been modified. The Authors gave some explanations in their response to the reviewer's comments but they have nothing changed in the text. The problem is that the published text should be written in a way that is clear to anyone who is interested in the author's	Inadequate tools were failed to recognize early detection...", " In this study 241 subjects (118 male, 123 women, and age ranges 30-70 years) were included..." "It was indicated that proximal tubular injury in diabetic conditions documented in literature that high glucose It was concluded that early detection of renal injury by analyzing routine renal markers (blood urea nitrogen and serum/ urine creatinine) are not enough", Corrected to "deletion, RT-PCR" Corrected to "recommended" We have studied polymorphisms of CD36 and LDLr that was the reason to focus on CD36 and LDLr. Since method used for RT-PCR is universally standardized and unique. Original method is not modified so taken as it. Changed



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

results. 6. Despite The Reviewer’s suggestion, no abbreviation list has been made. Neither, type of statistical tests used by the authors has been included. 7. Reviewer’s minor revision comments have been ignored. The short comment “Modified” is not true. 8.	Abbreviations are written in full form first time. Modified
--	---