



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJBcRR_6569
Title of the Manuscript:	The Importance of the RAS Interacting with the HGF/c-Met Receptor System in Hypertensive Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus
Type of the Article	Review

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	1. The association between RAS with HGF/c-Met and glycaemia control or degree of diabetic complications should be more described in detail and discussed in the specific paragraph. 2. Type 1 diabetes, type 2 diabetes and diabetes are used to describe the findings in the overall text of the current paper. This is very confusing. The terminology must be used strictly if an academic paper. 3. Similarly, hypertensive Type 2 diabetes and diabetes are mixed to describe the findings. 4. Clinical evidence of the topics should be shown in Table. 5. In the part 9, the description includes some speculative evidence. More modest description is suitable.	1 Additional information has been added regarding the relationship among the RAS, the HGF/c-Met system, diabetes and glycaemia in Section 7, first paragraph. 2 & 3. The majority of the descriptions concern Type 2 diabetes although occasionally the condition(s) described pertains to both Types 1 and 2. We have done our best throughout the manuscript to indicate when both Types 1 and 2 are involved, only Type 1 or only Type 2. 4 We attempted to construct such a table and found it to be very cumbersome and did little to further illustrate the clinical evidence. 5 Part 9 describes our current approach and associated research efforts. It is not intended to be anything other than that.
Minor REVISION comments	1. The word 'hypertensive diabetic patients' is sometimes seen, but this is not good. For instance, 'diabetic patients with hypertension' is favourable. 2. Several parts included the mistaken expressions: background perspective of diabetes (in the 1.1 subtitle: what do the authors mean?), a one year (in the part 5), hypertensive Type 2 patients (in the part 5), approaches be developed (in the part 10), c-Met binding), offer (in the part 10)...etc.	Minor point 1. We have changed "hypertensive diabetic patients" to "diabetic patients with hypertension" as requested throughout the manuscript. Minor point 2. We have changed Section 1.1. "Background perspective of Diabetes" to "Background Information" which is a more appropriate heading. Part 5: the phrase "a one year" has been changed to "over the duration of one year". Part 10: "novel approaches be developed" has been changed to "novel treatments be considered". Part 10: the



SDI Review Form 1.6

		comment concerning “c-Met binding” has been changed to “The presently described approach concerns the use of a small molecule HGF mimetic to increase HGF dimerization and binding to the c-Met receptor. Increased activation of c-Met receptors has been shown to facilitate proliferation and optimization of pancreatic β -cells.”
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, the paper is well written, but the speculative and definitive evidence must be separately described in a neutral sense (especially in the part 9).	