

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_86158
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of Urinary Level of Vitamin D Binding Protein in Diabetic Nephropathy
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>)

Review Form 1.6

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. Abstract: the results in the abstract don't match with the objective since it shows the correlation with only fasting BS and HbA1c. Also conclusion of the abstract says about the limitation of ' overestimation of specificity' which can be placed in the discussion. 2. In patients and Methods: the study period is mentioned as from 2018-2019. Please clarify if the patients were observed only for 1 year. Also is it possible to predict with this VBP only over a change in one year? Justify. Since development of nephropathy over long time. 3. In continuation with question no 2 , please clarify if this was a cohort study since Under Patients and Methods you mentioned , 'This prospective cohort observational study It seems you included patients of DM based on ACR criteria in two groups and a control group of healthy individuals. This is not a classical cohort study design. 4. Patients in group I and II must be receiving some anti diabetic agents. It would be good to add that data. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please clarify if patients with hypertension were excluded or not. If not then the anti0hypertensive agents patients received should be added. 2. How was the sample size determined for this study? 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If VDBP is also detected in bladder cancer then how is it specific for DN? 2. This is more like a cross sectional study designed to evaluate the association of severity of DN and Urinary levels of VDBP. 	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shruti Bhide
Department, University & Country	Seth GS Medical College and KEM Hopital, India