

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_127490
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Human Tumor necrosis factor - α (TNF- α) in Predicting Diabetic Nephropathy in Type II Diabetic patients
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Review Comments</p> <p>The primary research question is whether TNF-α is a predictive marker for diabetic nephropathy (DN). While previous studies have extensively investigated the role of TNF-α in the pathogenesis of DN, this study reveals a misalignment between the research question and the presented findings.</p> <p>For a study centred on predictive markers, emphasis should be placed on the early stages of nephropathy, or the study design should adopt a cohort approach. However, in the present research, TNF-α appears to be evaluated primarily as a diagnostic marker rather than a predictive one. This misalignment suggests that the article title does not fully reflect the study's objectives or findings, which should be addressed.</p> <p>Below are the specific issues and recommendations:</p> <p>1. General Critique</p> <p>If the study's aim is to investigate TNF-α as a predictive marker for DN, the focus should be on patients in the early stages of nephropathy or employ a cohort design. Instead, the study evaluates TNF-α as a diagnostic marker for DN. This suggests the article's title should better align with the content.</p> <p>2. Patients and Methods</p> <p>2.1 Study Design</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study adopts a case-control design rather than a cohort design. If the study is cross-sectional, it should provide data on the prevalence of DN or its complications in diabetic patients attending outpatient clinics within a specific timeframe (Page 2). 2. On what clinical or laboratory criteria was the diagnosis of diabetic nephropathy established? This needs to be clarified. 3. What specific complications of DN were considered in the study? <p>2.6 Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The biochemical material's preparation, storage, and analysis methods need to be described in detail to ensure reproducibility and clarity. <p>2.7 Statistical Analysis</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Descriptive statistical methods need not be described in detail. 2. The presentation of correlation results does not need to be exhaustive and can be summarized effectively. <p>3. Results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The results section repeats information that belongs in the materials and methods section, which should be avoided. 2. Abbreviations should be defined when first introduced, with the abbreviation provided in parentheses. 3. Table 1: If post-hoc tests after ANOVA were conducted, the results of group comparisons should be explicitly presented. If these comparisons are not included, references to post-hoc tests should be omitted. 4. The units for biochemical markers are missing and should be provided for clarity. 5. In Table 1, the variable duration needs clarification. What does it represent—days, years, or disease duration? If DN has been present for eight years, TNF-α cannot be considered an early predictive marker. 6. If DN is presented with and without complications, Table 2 should include a comparison between these groups (using Post-Hoc tests after ANOVA). 7. Were ROC analyses performed for other markers? The study results indicate statistical significance for markers besides TNF-α, which warrants exploration. 8. Comparisons with other markers are insufficient to justify why TNF-α is a reliable early predictive marker. Further rationale and analysis are needed. <p>Writing and Style</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stylistic and typographical errors are noted throughout the manuscript and require corrections. 2. The language and structure need improvement for better academic presentation. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>Conclusion The manuscript requires significant revisions to align the research question with the study design, methodology, and outcomes. Additionally, the analysis and presentation of results must address the inconsistencies and gaps outlined above. After incorporating these revisions, the manuscript should undergo a thorough review before resubmission.</p>	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with the 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 detail)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pusta Orujova
Department, University & Country	Azerbaijan Medical University, Azerbaijan