

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English corrections should be done. Very interesting findings but no real applicability/conclusion. I feel it just added data to the very crowded and contradictory market of research on the topic. To make the article more valuable, I suggest adding a conclusion with clinical impact that might be of use to readers. Also, try to summarize what are your thoughts about the literature review done, I felt it was done well but without any conclusion as well. You might think of adding at the end how your results compare to the previous ones and what is the added value of your study. The previous point also relates to the objective of the study which should include the "Why" of your research. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abbreviations should be introduced in the text the first time they appear. I suggest adding a list of abbreviations at the end. For the tables, especially Table 1, consider adding units for each measurement and a legend with all abbreviation's meanings. Figure 1 is not only related to the gender distribution but also to the nephropathy stages. Consider revising the titles. I know that the significant negative correlation between serum creatinine, urea, and HbA1c with vitamin D levels is not the main topic of this article but it would be nice to discuss the findings a bit more as they are interesting. 	
Optional/General comments	All in all, it is an interesting study but needs more highlighting on its importance and relevance in clinical terms. English revisions are highly needed.	

Review Form 1.6

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Diane Mourad</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>American University of Beirut, Lebanon</i>