

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 '**Jack 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 1.7

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	YES YES NO YES YES The summary may be too long and unnecessarily detailed. In addition, the journal should be structured within the framework of writing rules. The references are not up to date, it is recommended to use references from the last 5 years NO	First and foremost, we would like to thank the careful review carried out by the reviewer. We have made the modifications to the abstract suggested by the reviewer.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor REVISION It is recommended that the article be reviewed for language quality.	Language revision has been conducted as recommended by the reviewer.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript should be structured within the framework of the journal's editorial rules, the references in the manuscript should be strictly updated (last 5 years),	The manuscript has been formatted according to the recommendations found in the link below. https://peerreviewcentral.com/page/general-guideline-for-authors . The reviewer suggests using only references published in the last 5 years. Unfortunately, we will not be able to comply with the reviewer's request, as the methodology used in this integrative review involves articles published between 2001 and 2021. If we were to comply with the reviewer's request, we would have to conduct a new integrative review because one of the inclusion criteria would be substantially altered.

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>	