SDI Review Form 1.6

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)

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	**The author has to give his original text to someone who can translate it in English as this one has a lot of grammar problems especially the introduction and the discussion. Try to put numbers on each line so we can refer easily our ideas.** **Try to read about hypertension and microalbuminuria as it may have a link.** **The place where the study was done is not the one they should have chosen as even in hypertension patients alone the microalbuminuria can be found. So he had first to look for diabetes patients (T2DM) and then se if they have hypertension. The centre where the patients are coming from is initially a hypertensive one and not a diabetic one.** **How did you decide to take 180 patients instead of 372 patients.** **Didn't you find patients with macro albuminuria?** **You are talking about poor glycaemic control but no evidence in your study. You should have give us the value of HbA1c.** **In the conclusion you are talking about neuropathy but no tables had shown it.**	We have tried our best to reduce grammatical mistake in the revised version. Sorry we have not clarified you the study place. It's our mistake. At first we have selected the diabetic patients from a diabetic clinic who come there for treatment monitoring. And they took care from hypertension clinic also who were hypertensive. Due to time and resources constraint we decide to take 180 patients purposively instead of 372 patients. No patients were macroalbuminuric. We were taking the fasting blood sugar (FBS) level only and basis on this we stated patients were in poor glycemic control. We took the co-morbidities of the patients from their diabetic treatment monitoring books but not include in the results section. Because we put only important findings.
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.