

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Original Manuscript_JAMMR_117671 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Urinary transferrin as a marker of renal injury in diabetic individuals: an integrative review |
| 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.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) |
|--|---|--|
| <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>The manuscript is important for scientific community. The present study demonstrates the need in clinical practice to identify new biomarkers with potential for early diagnosis and risk stratification and monitoring of patients with DKD.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are sufficient.</p> | <p>Firstly, we would like to thank the reviewer for the thorough review. Additionally, we are honored to know that the objectives of this work were fully understood by the reviewer's assessment.</p> |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Authors suggested that urinary transferrin may exhibit superior sensitivity in identifying glomerular damage in diabetic patients compared to microalbuminuria, serving as an early indicator of DN and predicting the onset of microalbuminuria and progression of CKD. It includes the possibility of urinary transferrin as a biomarker for early DN diagnosis.</p> | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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> | |