



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_43386
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation Of Sialic Acid Levels With Lipid Profile And Anthropometric Variables In Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus And 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. Abstract: This needs to be clear without reference to the text. First, a brief statement about why the study is focusing on sialic acid is needed. Second, the number of Type 2 DM and DN subjects are listed separately. Were not all the DN patients also Type 2 DM patients? Lines 26-27: If there was no statistical significance, no correlation can be said to exist. 2. In defining Group I as DM without complications and Group II as DN is vague. Presumably, Group II are DM patients with DN. An important issue that is not addressed is whether the subjects have properly controlled blood glucose or what, if any, medications patients are taking. Without knowing this information, everything else is uninterpretable. Also, more specific information about each group of 25 subjects: Age, gender distribution, medications, glycemic control, etc. 3. The tables are not very clear. First, all abbreviations need to be defined. Second, presenting each group in a separate table makes comparisons difficult for the reader. 4. There is no mention of institutional review board approval and informed consent. This is absolutely required for human studies.	1,2,3: I have done the corrections suggested by the reviewer in the manuscript. 4. Ethical clearance was obtained by AJ Institute of medical sciences ethical clearance committee and informed consent was taken from study subjects and the same is mentioned in the manuscript line 71,72 and 73.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The authors present an interesting case control study to define a relationship between sialic acid in serum and urine with indicators of lipid status and obesity in diabetics and subjects with diabetic nephropathy. While reasonable rationale is presented, some aspects of data presentation are unclear. Further, more information about the subjects is needed to properly analyze and interpret the data.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	