

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJANR_96966
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiology of Chronic kidney disease of patients aged 20 years and above attending at King Fahad Specialist Hospital, Buraidah city, Qassim province, Saudi Arabia.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalijanr.com/index.php/IJANR/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)	This study only explains the incidence of CKD with other factors and has not linked it with the determinants of the disease, so planning and preventive action cannot be carried out. Please check the epidemiological definition, does this definition match the parameters you studied? The content of your research always mentions prevalence, and doesn't mention the word epidemiology Abstract does not yet describe the contents of the research comprehensively this abstract does not describe the overall results of the research and does not answer the research problem. In the discussion, only showing the results and description, but has not discussed in depth why these factors are correlated and uncorrelated, and have not compared with previous research. The preparation of the manuscript is quite adequate, but the contents need to be supplemented with in-depth studies in accordance with scientific standards. There are many newer references that can be used to support research related to CKD.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Please proofreading	
Optional/General comments		

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) The research implementation was by ethical principles and the protocol met the EC. It was carried out and declared feasible	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jatmiko Susilo
Department, University & Country	Universitas Ngudi Waluyo, Indonesia