

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nephrology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRN_101888
Title of the Manuscript:	Gitelman Syndrome presenting as Hypokalemic Periodic Paralysis : A Case Report
Type of the Article	Case study

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:

(<https://www.journalajrn.com/index.php/AJRN/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The importance of the case lies in the rarity of the disease, despite the clinical presentation described as WITHOUT metabolic alkalosis not being clear.</p> <p>2. The title is good because it draws attention to a clinical manifestation of the syndrome not described in the literature.</p> <p>3. The abstract is bad because, in addition to not talking about the manifestation of paralysis, it talks exactly about the syndrome and only puts a line on the case itself.</p> <p>4. I suggest changing the photo on the diagnostic flowchart and placing the laboratory test references. Also, place an arrow showing where U.</p> <p>5. I think yes.</p> <p>6. Suggestion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcl.2018.08.010 • DOI: 10.1111/cen.14104 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language/English needs to improve.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The text needs spell check and concordance to improve the clarity of the content.	

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gisane Cavalcanti Rodrigues
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Sao Paulo, Brazil