

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58147

Title: Glycaemic Control and its Impact on Lipid Profile and Renal Function in Type II Diabetes Mellitus: A Comparative Analysis by Disease Duration

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study:

- The study addresses an important clinical issue in diabetes management
- Objectives are clearly defined and relevant to current practice
- Appropriate statistical methods were applied to the collected data
- Ethical approval and informed consent are clearly documented
- Results are well presented with informative tables
- The discussion is supported by relevant literature
- Practical clinical implications are highlighted for patient care

Weakness of the study:

- The cross sectional design limits causal interpretation
- Sample size is relatively modest for subgroup analysis
- Single centre study limits generalizability of findings
- Medication use may have influenced biochemical parameters
- eGFR and urinary albumin assessment were not included
- Minor grammatical and formatting corrections are needed
- Longer follow up would strengthen the clinical conclusions

Reviewers Comments:

The manuscript investigates the relationship between glycaemic control, lipid profile, and renal function according to disease duration in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. The topic is clinically relevant and provides useful information for the early identification of cardiovascular and renal risk. The methodology is appropriate, and the statistical analysis is suitable for the study objectives. Ethical clearance and informed consent have been clearly mentioned, which strengthens the credibility of the research. The results are presented systematically and supported with clear tables and appropriate discussion. The manuscript is generally well written, although a few grammatical and language corrections would improve readability. The authors have acknowledged important limitations, including the cross sectional design, modest sample size, and lack of eGFR assessment. A broader multicentre study with longitudinal follow up would further strengthen the findings. Overall, the manuscript is scientifically sound and suitable for publication after minor revision.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to be original, and no obvious evidence of duplicate publication or copied material was identified during this review. No apparent plagiarism concerns were observed. However, the journal should perform a routine plagiarism similarity check before publication to confirm originality and ensure compliance with ethical publishing standards.