

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_110461</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Cannabinoid signaling in chronic kidney disease: A narrative review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Minireview Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> The paper aims to assess the correlation between circulating endocannabinoid levels and the progression of chronic kidney disease, and explore the potential clinical implications of these compounds. The study highlights the intricate interplay between the endocannabinoid system and renal physiology, emphasizing the need for a cautious approach in therapeutic interventions. It suggests that manipulating the endocannabinoid system could be a promising therapeutic strategy for kidney diseases.</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> The new title for the paper was “ Exploring the Role of the Endocannabinoid System in Chronic Kidney Disease: Implications for Therapeutic Interventions”</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> The abstract highlights the exploration of alterations in circulating endocannabinoid levels and their potential correlation with the progression of chronic kidney disease. It also mentions the potential implications for the clinical use of these compounds and the need for a circumspect methodology in the formulation of therapeutic interventions. Finally, it emphasizes the pivotal role of the endocannabinoid system in homeostasis and normal kidney function, as well as its potential as a therapeutic target for mitigating kidney disease and injury.</li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> The manuscript includes subsections such as the abstract, introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion, providing a clear and organized structure. The flowchart detailing the methodology ensures stringent inclusion and exclusion criteria, maintaining the precision and relevance of the literature surveyed.</li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> The manuscript follows a descriptive, qualitative, and retrospective observational study design, utilizing a methodological framework grounded in a bibliographic examination of publications featured in indexed journals. The study employed a comprehensive search strategy on the academic search platform PubMed, using relevant search terms and a chronological filter spanning the last 10 years. The manuscript includes a critical analysis of selected literature, ensuring the relevance and specificity of the included articles. Thus the manuscript presents a well-organized and scientifically grounded investigation. Some questions should be concerned as following: the authors should simply describe results of each trial in the Table. In discussion section, the authors should highly generally summarize the results of each trial, highlighting the results and significance of the innovative findings in this review, and present the limitation of the study, in addition, it should be brief and concise in the conclusions section.</li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references.</b> Yes, I presented two additional references as following:  (1)Liu, T., Wang, M., &amp; Wang, B. (2019). Mechanisms of adaptor protein p66Shc and endocannabinoid system in renal injury of chronic intermittent hypoxia. Chinese Journal of Asthma, 39, 1031-1034. (2) Jenkin, K., Verty, A., McAinch, A., &amp; Hryciw, D. (2012). Endocannabinoids and the renal</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	proximal tubule: an emerging role in diabetic nephropathy. The international journal of biochemistry & cell biology, 44 11, 2028-31 .	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English quality is OK.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sheng Kang</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tongji University, China</b>