Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AIR_47423**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Association between Microalbuminuria and Hypertension in Type 2 Diabetic Patients**
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	This is a nice study about "Association between Microalbuminuria and Hypertension in Type 2 Diabetic Patients". The author divided the study subjects in 2 groups, one group having normoalbuminuria, the other group with microalbuminuria. Both the group had diabetes and hypertension (as mentioned in inclusion criteria). The study reveals that the subjects having microalbuminuria (2nd group) were found to have increased mean blood pressure, fasting blood sugar and serum creatinine when compared to normoalbuminuric group (1st group). However, there are number of grammatical errors in English writing (including sentence constructions), which need a thorough revision. There are also some spellings mistakes/ inappropriate use of capital & small letters/ fusion of words (no gap after a word or full stop)/ unnecessary gaps, coma instead of full stop, etc. Some abbreviations were used without defining them (e.g. DN, NHRC). Some of the meaning of abbreviations explained (T2DM, SBP, DBP, MAP, MAU) but not used throughout the manuscript. The meaning of SBP, DBP have been repeatedly explained, but not used. Please make sure that all abbreviations are defined at first and then used consistently throughout. I would suggest even to define the commonly used abbreviation (e.g. FBS, sCreatinine, BUN, BMI) at the very beginning. **In general, careful editing and revision is needed**. **Abstract** In the results the author should have used the term mean blood pressure (instead of blood pressure) according to the values mentioned. In the conclusion the author mentioned "High prevalence of microalbuminuria was in type 2 diabetic outpatients with hypertension." It is not clear from the statement which category of hypertension had high prevalence of microalbuminuria; as both study group had hypertension (but the mean arterial pressure of 2nd group was higher than the 1st group). In the conclusion the author mentioned "Predictive factors for microalbuminuria were duration of hypertension, FBS, systolic blood pressure, sCreatinine and the presence of neuropathy." The duration of hypertension and presence of neuropathy were not mentioned in the study population. **Abstracts need revision and comprehensive construction.** **Introduction** Some of the sentences are not comprehendible. "The earliest stage of renal damage and aggressively controlling blood pressure screen is so much important". **Material and Methods** In the inclusion and exclusion criteria (2.2 Study population) the factors influencing albuminuria has been not mentioned (e.g., urinary tract infection, congestive heart failure, acute febrile illness, menstruation or vaginal discharge, exercise within 24 hours, marked hyperglycaemia, marked hypertension and high protein diet). Whether those factors were excluded or not while determining albuminuria? Only vigorous exercise was mentioned. ACE inhibitors/ ARBs reduces albuminuria and also controls BP. Whether these drugs were used in the study subjects. Whether pregnant patients were excluded in the study or not? Study design has been written twice (section 2.2 & 2.5). "This cross-sectional descriptive	We have made a thorough check on every section: abstract, introduction, materials and methods, results, discussion and conclusion. Diabetic was a common characteristics but not all were in hypertensive condition. We have checked the grammatical error best, spelling mistake and inappropriate use of capital and small letters. And further check the unnecessary gaps and full stop etc and also the abbreviation. In abstract, introduction, material and methods, results, discussion and conclusion section we have corrected according to your guideline.

	study was carried out between January 2018 and March 2018 to investigate the correlation between microalbuminuria and hypertension among T2DM patients". Between January and March means, the study was carried out in February. I would suggest to specify the date e.g., 1st January to 30th March 2018. "Mean arterial pressure (MAP) was calculated as systolic + (2xdiastolic) pressure" in measurement section. Please review the definition and clarify it. In introduction, microalbuminuria and macroalbuminuria were defined by ACR or albumin creatinine ration; therefore, I would suggest not to use the term micro albumin: creatine ratio, which may be confusing; to make the manuscript consistent, please use the term ACR throughout. **Results** The following sentence is not comprehendible (Baseline Characteristics of Group 1 and Group 2): "In group 1, 27.1% and in group 2, 72.9% had positive history of DM". The author is advised to make it clear (did the author mean whether family history was present or not?). **Discussion** The author is suggested to review the following sentence and construct accordingly: "A well-known United Kingdom (UKPDS)…….. which was also support our study." The sentence is incomplete: "In general microalbuminuria is a susceptible marker for damage induced by diabetes". Marker of damage of which organ? Kidney or anything else? **Conclusion** The author divided the study subjects in 2 groups, one group having normoalbuminuria, the other group with microalbuminuria. Both the group had diabetes and hypertension (as mentioned in inclusion criteria). The study reveals that the subjects having microalbuminuria (2nd group) were found to have increased mean blood pressure, fasting blood sugar and serum creatinine when compared to normoalbuminuric group (1st group). The author stated that "Predictive factors for microalbuminuria were duration of hypertension, FBS, systolic blood pressure, sCreatinine and the presence of neuropathy." However, the duration of hypertension and presence of neuropathy were not mentioned in the study population that would influence microalbuminuria. **Conclusion needs revision and comprehensive construction.** **Table—3**. The word "mmHg" may be added beside/ beneath the variables (Blood Pressure). **Recommendation: Major revision** In general, a thorough editing and revision is needed. The revised paper needs further review. Author should send a file showing clearly all the revisions done in the text of the paper. The revised words/ sentences should be highlighted in yellow colour.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)*	Study was approved by the institutional ethics committee and written informed consent was taken from all the patients before collecting blood and urine sample.