



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMMR_16214
Title of the Manuscript:	The Possible Mechanisms through which Dietary Protein Increases Renal Blood Flow and Glomerular Filtration Rate
Type of the Article	Review 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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The authors revise mechanisms responsible for renal hemodynamic changes produced by high protein diet. It seems a didactic review.</p> <p>The Authors are kindly recommended to review the References. I am pointing out some whose names of authors were not properly cited: 1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15, 38, 54 e 75.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Line 110, type error: "throuphg" 2) From line 144 to line 147: Unclear phrase, maybe the word "observed" is missing. 3) From line 147 to 148: Is this phrase repeating the above one? 4) Line 177: It is suggested prostaglandins, instead prostaglandin. 5) At the end of line 202: Maybe, it istheir inhibition... 6) Line 231: The study by Tuttle and coworkers? 7) Line 244: Study by Yao and coworkers? Moreover, it is suggested that authors rewrite the phrase. Reference 57 was not properly addressed here. This reference is a review that does not deal on protein diet. 8) The phrase beginning at line 246 is too long. At line 249, there is a type error. 9) Line 265: Please, replace the capital letter "intra-renal" 10) Line 269: prokallikrein 11) The phrase beginning at line 273 is too long. It is suggested to break it. 12) Line 279: It is suggested that the phrase be rewrite. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Is bradykinin an antagonist to B2 kinin receptor? “ ...GFR and RPF responses...” Maybe, alterations. 13) Line 287: Jaffa and colleagues ... 14) Line 288: “respectively” does not seem appropriate here. 15) Line 307: ... renin angiotensin system... 16) Line 314: The macula 17) Line 318: “Studies” at the begin of phrase is not consonant with a unique reference. 18) Line 335: It is suggested the phrase be rewrite. 19) Line 337: The study by ... differed from? 20) Line 343: Adenosine A1- receptor...This phrase is unclear. 21) Line 345: From previous studies above... Reference 11? 22) Line 352: The information regarding methodological influence on the GFR is seminal. However, details are not relevant in this context. 23) Line 372: Again,...renin angiotensin system...</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ana D. O. Paixão
Department, University & Country	Physiology and Pharmacology, Federal University of Pernambuco, Brazil