SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Blood Research & Reviews**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IBRR_48732**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Relationship among HbA1c and some Markers of Endothelial Damage in type 2 Diabetes Mellitus**
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)

SDI 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	• **Abreviations appearing first time in main text must have expanded version followed by abreviation within brachets: 'the major physiological inhibitor of tPA' – change it as: 'tissue plasminogen activator (tPA).'** • **Key words must be 5-10 in number in MeSH terms other than those found in title in alphabetical order.** • **References are not up to date.** • **References list also should be numbered in square brackets as in main text citations.** • **The references should be in Vancouver style. For full details on this refer to the following link to university of Queensland (http://www.library.uq.edu.au/training/citation/vancouv.pdf** • **The titles of journals should be in italics and abbreviated according to the style used in Index Medicus/ NLM Catalog.** • **Sample size is small and number of patients. in the study group and in the control group is not statistically equal (30 in study group and 25 in control group. It could have been made 30 and 30). Atleast this could have been mentioned as limitations of study with reasoning.** • **It is mentioned as 'apparently healthy persons in the conrol group', what does it mean? Either symptomatically healthy or T2DM ruled out with investigation? It has to be clarified.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	**Well done study.** **Corrections and suggesions mentioned above have to be caried out by the authors.**	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***N.S. Kannan***
Department, University & Country	***Sri Manakula Vinayagar Medical College Hospital, Pondicherry University, India***