



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_43625
Title of the Manuscript:	THE PREVALENCE, PATHOPHYSIOLOGY, MOLECULAR MECHANISMS AND BIOCHEMICAL PATHWAYS IN THE PATHOGENESIS DIABETIC RETINOPATHY– AN OVERVIEW.
Type of the Article	Review 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>)

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	A deep professional English grammar and spelling revision is needed. Citation is not homogenous along the MS (see Global prevalence where, also, some citation is misleading). Figures seem to be taken from different sources and are not properly cited. Article style with such a lot paragraphs are sometimes confusing so a new distribution should be suggested. Sometimes sentences are too short, not related with the previous and not properly cited and includes some statements that are not fully accepted (f.i. L472).	1)Grammar and spellings attended to the best of knowledge. 2)Abridged citation , which is universally acpted by most journals has to be followed in some instances as the total references cited are nearly one hundred. Found nothing misleading citation in global prevalence. 3).source of figures acknowledged as suggested . 4) All paragraphs are properly given headings and sub headings. Renumbering is done as it is confusing to the reviewer. 5) The reference to line 472 is regarding role of neurotrophins well documented in literature . It may be noted that no where the author asserted including the objection pointed , that what is brought under review is accepted or not. Even un accepted evidences may find relevance later or remain as historical perspectives. Kindl accept the author's point of view, for which , he will be thankful.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)	