

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJANR_97335</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Prevalence and risk factors of chronic kidney disease among non-clinical Healthcare Providers at the Rivers State University Teaching Hospital Port-Harcourt, Nigeria</b>
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.journalijanr.com/index.php/IJANR/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes , the study looks at prevalence of CKD in NCP in a single region of south Nigeria.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>By and large Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes for the most part	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1) The authors are advised to reduce the burden of tables in the manuscript. Table 3 ,4 and 5 and essentially repeats of the same material and I am sure that everything relevant can be soundly explained by only one table . That said, table 4 itself has hypertension and diabetes mellitus being repeated twice in the same table.</p> <p>2) Please explain how HTN isn't a significant risk factor but HTN medication is ?</p> <p>3) The discussion needs to be refined as to content and lucidity. It isn't surprising that HTN,DM and previous h/o kidney disease remain the most important risk factors for development and progression of CKD. The authors need to highlight what if any additional information at all was gleaned from their preliminary study and how they would like to take the findings of this study forward.</p> <p>4) No mention of qualitative proteinuria and its relevance to CKD anywhere in the study. Quantification of proteinuria has not been done as part of the study design.</p>	

### 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shobhana Nayak Rao
Department, University & Country	India