

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77406
Title of the Manuscript:	Vitamin D in different stages of type 2 Diabetic nephropathy –A cross sectional study.
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Authors propose a review aimed to analyze vitamin D status in different stages of type 2 diabetic nephropathy. The aim of paper appears clear but not so good treated in the abstract as good resumed in the title of manuscript. Abstract is confused, without a good readability. It contains several linguistic and content mistakes. Syntax needs to be improved.</p> <p>References are appropriate, relevant but and recent.</p> <p>Introduction is not complete, treating only superficial matters in just known in the literature. The research question is not enough outlined and it doesn't justify what is already known about the topic. I suggest improving something about nephropathy, diabetes, and the physiology of vitamin D with any reference to PTH, calcium, phosphorus, klotho, FGF23 and mineral bone disorder. I</p> <p>Methods of research are good exposed.</p> <p>Discussion of treated matter is just performed in coherent way, but sometimes it could be overinterpretaed. Limitations of your manuscript are not fatal and they could became opportunities to inform future research. Conclusions could be better exposed.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Concetto Sessa
Department, University & Country	"Maggiore" Hospital, Modica, Ragusa, Italy