

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nephrology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRN_95601
Title of the Manuscript:	HISTOPATHOLOGICAL PATTERN OF NEPHROTIC SYNDROME IN ILE-IFE, SOUTHWESTERN NIGERIA. A 16-YEAR RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW.
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.journalajrn.com/index.php/AJRN/editorial-policy>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The paper presents the data on underlying kidney pathology of the patients who underwent kidney biopsy due to nephrotic syndrome in a single center in Ile Ife, Nigeria, between 2002 and 2017. The paper also gives revised kidney pathology data after revision using immunoperoxidase stainings which were not used in the first place.</p> <p>The whole cohort is quite small and the electron microscopy which is a mainstay in the analysis of renal biopsies was not performed, however the paper could be of interest for publishing since</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) provides important preliminary data to guide local nephrologists and provide the basis for further studies on the aetiopathogenesis of the disease in Tropical Africa, b) makes medical population aware that immunofluorescence and electron microscopy which are standard in most of the western countries are still not available in developing countries, c) confirms that diagnosis cannot be just made according to the light microscopy but includes at least immunofluorescence/immunoperoxidase stainings. <p>The title is suitable for the paper – I would just add “s” for plural in the word patternS and put hyphen instead of dots between the two sentences.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive, however the authors should use the subheadings proposed by the journal.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript seems scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent, however according to the journal rules In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets so please do so.</p> <p>I would like to make few additional points which from my point of view should be revised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. include key words. 2. I would revise the sentence “...since use of immunofluorescence and electron microscopy for paraffin embedded sections are not routinely available in the Nigeria yet.” since electron microscopy is not being done on paraffin sections. 3. Please define how many biopsies were there in total before the exclusion and how many were excluded 4. define which antigen retrieval method you were using 5. I want authors to define whether nephrotic syndrome in children in Nigeria is usually cured ex iuvantibus by steroids and biopsy performed only if steroid resistant or the the biopsy is done to each nephrotic sy child patient – most of the guidelines suggest not to perform biopsy right away since MCD is usually steroid sensitive and if this is the case in Nigeria as well could be a bias of the paper and should be clearly written that FSGS in the most common finding in children with nephrotic syndrome not responding to ex iuvantibus treatment. 6. The authors mention in the Discussion part that: It is a major indication for renal biopsy in our center within the study period and accounted for 58.5% of the cases of renal diseases where biopsies were carried out. I suggest to mention these percentages in the patient and methods part as well or put a reference if it was published before. 7. I suggest to discuss importance of immunoperoxidase staining when defining the final diagnosis and also comment on electron microscopy which was lacking in this case. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Correct typos in the text.</p> <p>I suppose the statistical program which was used was SPSS, not Windows.</p> <p>I suggest using the same nomenclature for membranous nephropathy in the whole paper.</p> <p>I suggest using the whole word followed by abbreviation and the using the abbreviation later in the text.</p> <p>Make a legend for abbreviations used in the Table 1.</p> <p>Is Figure 3&4 one figure or two – in case these are two figures A and B panels are not necessary</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sandra Karanović Stambuk
Department, University & Country	School of Medicine, University of Zagreb, Croatia