

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.	This manuscript explores the potential of Tumor Necrosis Factor-Alpha (TNF- α) as an early biomarker for diabetic nephropathy, a critical microvascular complication of diabetes. It contributes to understanding the inflammatory processes associated with diabetic nephropathy, providing valuable insights into early detection and management strategies. The study is particularly relevant in regions with a high prevalence of diabetes, such as Egypt, and can guide clinicians in improving patient outcomes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "The Role of Human Tumor Necrosis Factor- α (TNF- α) in Predicting Diabetic Nephropathy in Type II Diabetic Patients," is suitable as it clearly defines the scope and focus of the manuscript. However, a slight revision could make it more concise, such as: "Human Tumor Necrosis Factor- α as a Predictive Biomarker for Diabetic Nephropathy in Type II Diabetes."	
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.	The abstract provides a clear summary of the background, aim, methods, results, and conclusion. However, including the statistical findings in the results section (e.g., specificity and sensitivity of TNF- α) would enhance its comprehensiveness.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is appropriate, with well-defined sections for introduction, methods, results, and discussion. Including more visuals, such as figures for statistical analysis and tables summarizing findings, would further improve the manuscript's readability and impact.	
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.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness through its detailed methodology and rigorous statistical analysis. The use of a cross-sectional study design and the inclusion of relevant biomarkers strengthen its reliability. The strong correlation between TNF- α and various clinical parameters indicates that the study is technically sound. However, the discussion could expand on the limitations and future research directions to provide a more balanced perspective.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and include recent studies, which enhance the credibility of the manuscript. Including additional references related to novel TNF- α inhibitors and their therapeutic implications in diabetic nephropathy would be valuable.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language is generally suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical corrections and sentence restructuring would improve readability and ensure clarity.	
Optional/General comments	The study is significant in exploring a critical area of diabetes management. Including a comparison of TNF- α with other biomarkers could enhance its clinical applicability. A clearer emphasis on the potential applications of the findings in clinical practice is recommended.	

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> There are no apparent ethical issues in this manuscript. The study design and methodology, including participant selection and data collection, appear to follow standard ethical guidelines. However, it is essential to clarify whether informed consent was obtained from all participants and if the study was approved by a recognized ethics committee. This should be explicitly stated in the "Patients and Methods" section.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sara Fekri Abbasgafer
Department, University & Country	Zagazig University, Egypt