



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>Main query:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. During the discussion of possible mechanism behind the regulation of RBF & GFR, instead of repeatedly describing the finding from other paper in details, author should briefly summarise the main finding from previous papers to support each of the discussion point. Suggest author to re-format the paper by focusing on describing the possible regulatory mechanism with supporting experimental evidences from other papers. <p>Other queries:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The whole review seems a bit boring. Suggest author to summarize the content discussed in graphical form (e.g. flow chart/mind map for possible external & internal mechanisms modulating renal blood flow) at some point in the text to allow reader to have a quick understanding. This will also make the paper more interesting to read. 2. Please include referencing for line 41-42. 3. Re-phrasing is needed for line 86-89 as the sentence is too long and confusing. Suggest to divide it into 2 sentences. 4. Grammar error in line 110. 5. Re-phrasing is needed for line 110-115 as the sentence is too long and confusing. Suggest to 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	divide it into 2 sentences.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ng Zhi Xiang
Department, University & Country	Department of Biomedical Science, Faculty of Medicine, MAHSA University, Malaysia