Gene, Cell and Tissue
Volume 10 · Issue 3 · e134691

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Investigating the Effect of Thyroid Hormones on Diabetic Nephropathy in Type 2 Diabetic Patients Referred to Ahvaz Hospitals in 2017

Sara Khoramnia, Atousa Moradzadegan

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
3 Jan 2023	16 Jan 2023	21 Jan 2023	10.5812/gct-134691

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Referee 2 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5

1 Original submission

2 comments · 4 Jan 2023 – 8 Jan 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 4 Jan 2023

1. In line 116, please write SPSS (Chicago, IL).
2. In line 120, please write study population instead of "studied subjects".
3. Please separate the conclusion and discussion.
4. In line 119, please write Results.

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 8 Jan 2023

Dear Authors
1- The biochemistry kit used was probably Pars Azmoun.
2- At the end of the discussion, it would be appropriate to have a clearer summary or (Conclusion).

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewer 1:
1. In line 116 please write SPSS(Chicago, IL) Resprctfully done
2. In line 120 please wright study population instead of "studied subjects" Resprctfully done
3. Please separate the conclusion and discussion Resprctfully done
4. In line 119 please write Results Resprctfully done
Reviewer 2:
The manuscript entitled " Investigating the effect of thyroid hormones on diabetic nephropathy in type 2 diabetic patients referred to Ahvaz hospitals in 2017" is useful and practical. However, I have minor points on it.

It is better to draw 3 curves 2-4 on a figure. In this case, readers can more easily compare the curves visually in a figure1.
With respect, I am subpoenaing, considering that I had taken help from someone to calculate the statistical data of this research and currently I do not have access to them and the raw data, I would be grateful if the graphs are accepted in the same way. Thanks

2-it was said "a sensitivity of 63 and a specificity of 61 can be considered as a marker for the differentiation of diabetic nephropathy (Figure 2)", sensitivity and specificity are reported as a percentage. please modify in the entire file.
Resprctfully done

3- you said "it was observed that there is a significant difference between the two groups (p>0.001).", it should be "<" (less sign). Resprctfully done

4-Odds ratios are adjusted or crude? Please explain more.

Considering the possible effect of age and gender on the relationship between thyroid hormones and TSH hormone with diagnosed idiopathic, this relationship was adjusted for these possible confounding factors.
This explaination is added to the manuscript.

5- you should in the "data analysis" explain how appropriate cut-of values were determined. or how to interpret the area under the ROC curve (AUC). you can use a recently published study.
Resprctfully done. Thank you so much for your guidance.
Azarbad A, Aghnia T, Gharibzadeh A, Rafati S, Hashemi SM, Zarei H, Kheirandish M. Cut-off points for anthropometric indices to screen for hypertension among Iranian adults of the Bandare-Kong cohort: a cross-sectional study. BMC Public Health. 2022 Dec;22(1):1-2.
Reviewer 3:
Dear Authors
1- The biochemistry kit used was probably Pars Azmoun Resprctfully done
2- At the end of the discussion, you would be appropriate to have a clearer summary or (Conclusion) Resprctfully done

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 17 Jan 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 17 Jan 2023

Respectfully, the author made the changes that the reviewers suggested. In my opinion, the manuscript now meets the criteria to be considered for publication.
Accept
Thanks