

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nephrology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRN_96136
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge about the kidney, kidney disease, prevention and therapeutic options among non-clinical Healthcare Providers at a tertiary facility in Southern Nigeria
Type of the 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:

(<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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	In my opinion , this study looking at knowledge and perceptions of NCP in a single centre in Southern Nigeria is not novel and basically reinforces the point that better education regarding preventative measures for NCD are necessary in all low income and LMIC. Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Largely Yes ,however I would suggest that the results can be presented and worded better. A lot of repetition is seen .	
Optional/General comments	1) What is the objective of stating the medical details of the voluntary participants and the use of this data in relation to their knowledge base regarding CKD...? 2) What is meant by regular painkiller use? Is this monthly , weekly...? The authors need to clarify this . 3) The authors need to offer solutions to the larger problem of poor knowledge amongst NCP.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shobhana Nayak Rao
Department, University & Country	GNRC Inst of Medical Sciences, India