

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAMMR_91387 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | The Role of Netrin-1 and Interleukin-6 in Diabetic Nephropathy in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus |
| 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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The present results are similar to the previous reports and consistent with what was expected. 2. The authors should show the reason for dividing into 4 groups of the subjects. 3. Serum albumin level was 4.26 g/dl, and creatinine was 0.73 mg/dl in Group I. Then, why you can obtain 30 mg/g of albumin/creatinine ration? 4. Twenty-five subjects per group are too few to discuss the results. Why did the authors think that 25 samples were enough? 5. In Discussion, the authors described whether their results were similar to or consistent with the previous reports. It is necessary to conclude what can be said by summarizing them. 6. Discuss the functional relationship among Netrin-1, IL-6, albumin, creatinine, blood glucose, hypertension, etc. 7. Figure 1 is unusual. Before presenting ROC curve, it needs a scatter dot plot of Netrin-1 and IL-6 levels. 8. Conclusion is weak. Describe what is novel. | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>Abbreviations are given full names at the first appearance.</p> <p>The first ten lines in Discussion have many line breaks. Discussion should be divided into several paragraph with mini-conclusion.</p> | |
| 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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Name: | Takaki Hiwasa |
| Department, University & Country | Chiba University, Japan |