



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_53121
Title of the Manuscript:	Association of the +936 C/T Single Nucleotide Polymorphism of the VEGF-A gene with renal cell cancer in an Eastern Indian population
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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>The manuscript is interesting. however, I suggested to complete the following:</p> <p>Language: I suggest a final review of text by a professional English-speaking.</p> <p>Methodology: Review some technical aspects such as the OD260/OD280 ratio (maximum 2.0) and correct the name of the restriction enzyme (HindIII).</p> <p>The calculation of the Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium, in a genetic association study of this type and to avoid biased inferences, it is always necessary to calculate this parameter from the genotype frequencies of the proposed variants. They can be reported at the bottom of the table.</p> <p>Results: I suggest including in tables 1 and 2, together with the crude p-value, the adjusted p-value and the Odds ratio (OR) with a 95% confidence interval (multivariable analysis) to measure the strength of association.</p> <p>Discussion: Adequate the new results and discussion considering the recommendations above.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Many paragraphs of the text are long, so smaller paragraphs are suggest with a separate point without affecting the meaning of the phrase.</p>	
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p> <p>Yes, in the selection criteria. The detail:</p> <p>"The study strictly adhered to the ethical guidelines stipulated by Hensinki declaration for human studies and ICMR, India. All ethical protocols were followed as directed by the institutional ethical committee and the study was undertaken only after obtaining the institutional ethical clearance".</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Oscar Acosta-Conchucos</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos & Universidad San Martín de Porres, Peru</i>