

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_85832
Title of the Manuscript:	Deranged Haematological Profile and Dyslipidaemia in Diabetes Induced 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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	<p>Review of the manuscript entitled: <i>Deranged Haematological Profile and Dyslipidaemia in Diabetes Induced Nephropathy</i> The manuscript submitted is appropriate to the subject matter and scientific rigor. The authors raised a very current issue at work, which is not only interesting from a scientific but also a practical point of view. Some remarks improving the quality of future research. and suggested changes and comments to the submitted manuscript in order to improve the quality of the planned research and future publications below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Please complete abstract. I believe that the data collection and laboratory methods should also be added in abstract not only to characterize the research group also would you please add a few statements about Haematology profile and statistics.2. Please check and fix the references according to the comments in the attachment. There are major discrepancies.3. Would you please add the DOI or other electronic access in all your references standardize the page numbers in accordance with the journal's guidelines - either full or abbreviation.4. I believe that reference position [2] and [7] authors should remove from the reference and refer to the research carried out on people no dogs or rats.5. In methodology when authors when describing a Haematology profile and Quick's method and spectrophotometric method and enzymatic method, they should add a references. Remaining comments in the article in the attachment.	<p>Thank you for the valuable suggestions all the suggested amendments done in the manuscript</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Abstract done2. Done3. M4. Reference number 2 and 7 data replaced with human study5. Reference added in the manuscript
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The authors wrote in the bibliography of the journal, which are not referred to in the text of the reviewed article, please remove them. For example references number: [12], [13] and [14] and <i>Zhao Y, Zhang J, Zhang J, Wu J.</i>Would you please remove them from references or add them in the text of this article.2. I believe that authors should refer to current scientific journals, most of them the authors refer to is the year: 2002, 2004 ... 2016... only one item is from 2020.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Done extra references are removed from the manuscript2. Most of the references are updated
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I do not have access to this publication (LaPierre D. Dyslipidaemia. 2011. Http: //www. Sharinginhealth.Ca/ conditions_and_diseases/dyslipidemia.Html), There are errors in the internet address Would you please refer to another Journal.	Reference updated

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