

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_100496
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of antioxidant capital in Senegalese type 2 diabetics.
Type of the 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.journalajbgmb.com/index.php/AJBGMB/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes. Measurement of oxidant and antioxidant status in diabetic patients is important in the assessment of chronic complications.</p> <p>No : Evaluation of non enzymatic status in.....</p> <p>Yes, but prospective study should be removed. State that levels of the biochemical parameters were measured.</p> <p>Yes. However, the tables should have come last and a brief acknowledgment.</p> <p>Yes and No. The prospective aspect is not reported. Thus, sample size is small. No mention of control subjects. A table should be on one page not two. Table I should come before II in the text.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Methodology: Crosssectional study not prospective study. Age, sex and BP are not anthropometric data. Uraemia, uricaemia, etc are not analytes rather, urea, uric acid, etc. Biochemical parameters preferable to biological parameters. GFR obtainedbetter than GFR assessed.... There is need to include control subjects in these work.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, but the spellings are not consistent.....Mixture of America and British.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This work is more like a preliminary report and should include control subjects. Glycaemia (tables II and IV) is not an analyte. What reference or standard values did the authors use to compare the diabetic results with? First line under discussion, during DM should be in DM. Hyprer LDL should be high LDL.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Peter O Anaja
Department, University & Country	Ahmadu Bello University, Nigeria